

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 87.—No. 10.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 7TH, 1835.

[Price 1s. 2d.]



PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Choice of Speaker.

King's Speech.

Address.

Miserable State of the Whigs.

TO THE PEOPLE OF OLDHAM.

Normandy, 3. March, 1835.

MY FRIENDS,—I am very anxious that you should well understand what has just been passing in the House of Commons, particularly with regard to the matters which I have placed at the head of this paper, beginning with the choice of the Speaker. This was a matter of perfect indifference in itself to any independent member of Parliament; but a great deal was made of it, and monstrous efforts on both sides to obtain a majority; the Whigs looking upon it as a question that would decide the fate of the new Ministry. Every man of sense knew that it would not; but this the Whigs thought; and, therefore, every man that voted on their side, did, in fact, vote for bringing the Whigs again into power. How those who call themselves Radicals could possibly reconcile a vote of this sort to the just abhorrence which they had so long been expressing against the conduct of these Whigs, appears, at first sight, unaccountable enough; but I have heard, that they justify this vote in this way: "Let us have the Whigs back again;

"and then they will be so low, they will be so stripped of all party-power, that they will be compelled to yield to us Radicals; and to do any thing that we want them to do; they will be compelled, indeed, to take some of us into the Ministry": and, indeed, it was openly acknowledged, that Mr. O'CONNELL and some others were to form a part of this new Whig-Ministry! For my part, I was quite sure that the Whig-faction would never agree to this; but would rather either join the Tories, or support them. However, as far as I was concerned, I had nothing to do with this. If I had voted for Mr. ABERCROMBY, I should have voted for forcing the Whigs back again upon the King; I should have voted for those who had passed the Dead-body Bill, the Poor-law Bill, and who had rescinded the vote for the repeal of the malt-tax. If I had voted for Mr. MANNERS SUTTON I should have voted in the teeth of the principles which guided my vote when he was put in by the Whigs; and, therefore, I did not vote at all.

Next came the Address on the King's Speech. The tone and the language of this speech was so good; so kind towards the people; so different from the tone and the language of every speech which we have ever heard, from the beginning of the French war to the present day; and it formed such a striking contrast with the ill-natured, the angry, the threatening, the sanguinary speeches which the Whigs put into the mouth of the King, that I was extremely anxious to vote for it; but there were two passages in it (which, of course, were echoed in the Address), to which I could not say "AYE:" namely, the passage which describes the ruinous state of agriculture to have arisen from the "PRESSURE OF LOCAL CHARGES," which I well knew not only to be a monstrous absurdity, but a mischievous absurdity at the same time, and a most mischievous one too; the local charges having always been; the local charges falling upon the consumer, in

fact, and not upon the land; the charges properly local, as to agriculture, not amounting to two millions a year, while the gross produce of the land sells, this year, for, probably, *thirty millions less than it sold for last year!* The other passage related to the reforms in the *church of England*, which I know are more delusive than I can describe them to be. Therefore, I could not vote for this Address.

Then came the "*Amendment*," which, in the first place, left the whole of the original Address just as it was; with all the absurdity and delusion that I have just been describing; and then made the addition to this amount: "*That we regretted that the King had dissolved the late Parliament, which was just then earnestly intent, in making all those reforms which the people most anxiously wished for.*" For me to vote for this, who had to the last moment of their sitting represented them as engaged in doing every thing that was bad, and intending every thing that was bad; for Mr. FIELDEN to vote for this, who, in public meeting at MANCHESTER, had expressed his hope that the King would dismiss this worst and most unfeeling of all Parliaments; for us to vote, that we regretted the dismissal of those whose last act was that of passing the Poor Law Bill; for us to express our opinion that that Parliament was doing just the things which you wished to have done, would have been, not folly, not inconsistency, but it would have been downright, barefaced infamy. Yet, as we could not vote *against* this Amendment, without voting *for* the Address, containing the two dangerous and prodigious errors before-mentioned, we did not vote at all.

The Whigs, united with those who call themselves Radicals, carried their Speaker by a majority of ten; and carried their Amendment to the Address by a majority of seven. What could induce some gentlemen to vote with them upon those occasions I cannot say. Most assuredly the *tendency*, and even the object, of both these divisions were, *to bring the Whigs back again into power*. Now, then, I suppose, that Lord JOHN RUSSELL and his late colleagues had satisfied Mr. O'CON-

NELL, and the Irish members that voted with him, that, if they came into power again, they would not only not recommend the King to mark Mr. O'CONNELL out in his Speech as a person to be counteracted and dealt with; that they would not only carefully abstain from doing this in future; but that they would repeal the Irish Coercion Bill, which still remains in force, as to all its severities towards the people of Ireland; when we have it declared, distinctly, that they pledged themselves to act thus when they got into power again, then we shall see that Mr. O'CONNELL had good reason for the votes which he gave in this case.

We remember, that Mr. ATTWOOD and Mr. O'CONNELL both, at NEWHALL-hill, supported an address to the King, to turn out the Whig Ministers. Now, if they have satisfied Mr. ATTWOOD, that they will, when they come in again, act in a manner different from what they did before; if they have satisfied him that they will, when they come in, not be again that COARSER-FOOD MINISTRY which he described them to be; if they have satisfied him that they will repeal that horrible Poor-law Bill, and send LEWIS and his tribe, and penny-a-line CHADWICK, to cracking of stones; if he will tell us, that they have satisfied him as to these matters, then we shall be ready to allow that Mr. Attwood, in voting to get them back again into power, has acted a very consistent part; especially, if they have further satisfied him that they will make an expansion of the currency; and, instead of jeering at him, scoffing at him, giving the hint to their battalion to let him be counted out; or, when that is impracticable, to set up a braying, a cock-crowing, a laughing, a scoffing, such as the world never heard before, in any assembly whatever; if, indeed, they have promised him, that they will give him a patient hearing in future, in addition to all the other promises that I have mentioned; then, indeed, Mr. ATTWOOD has done right in the votes which he gave for bringing the Whigs back into power.

If the Whigs have pledged themselves to Mr. TENNYSON, that, when they get back into power, they will agree to his motion, for *shortening the duration of*

Parliaments, instead of scouting his motion, and lashing the author of it, with the best and sharpest sarcasm that they had at their command; cutting him back-stroke and fore-stroke, with ridicule too much, one would have thought, for mortal to endure: if they have pledged themselves to Mr. TENNYSON, that, when they come into power again, they will agree to this motion of his; then, indeed, Mr. TENNYSON can easily account to his constituents of LAMBETH, why he endeavoured to get these Whigs back again into power; because the pious people of LAMBETH well know, that as Christians, we are to exercise *forgiveness of injuries*; and that, though our brother offend us seventy times seven, still we are to forgive our brother; but the condition is, that he first *repent*, and, if he be able, *make atonement*. Upon the supposition, therefore, that they have agreed to support Mr. TENNYSON, when they again come into power, the people of LAMBETH ought to applaud Mr. TENNYSON for his vote.

In like manner, I must suppose, that they have pledged themselves to Mr. HARVEY that, when they come in again, they will not oppose his motion for an *inquiry into the pension-list*; and that, so far from accusing him of a want of "*gentlemanlike feeling*"; so far from accusing him of *malignant motives*, they will see the reasonableness, and the justice of his motion; and will adopt it accordingly; and I say, that, on the supposition that they have given him this assurance, Mr. HARVEY has done right in supporting them, and doing his best to get them back again into power.

To ME, however, they have given no assurance at all; nor can they, for I would not believe them, say what they would upon such a subject. But, my friends, mark the situation in which the Whigs would be, if they were to get back again into power. Suppose Messrs. O'CONNELL, ATTWOOD, HARVEY, TENNYSON, to repeat their motions (and they are bound to repeat them), the Whigs would be compelled again to resort to the Tories, to give them their support against these motions, just as they did before; for as to their agreeing to the motions, none

but a madman can suppose the thing possible; and, indeed, they have told us this already, in pretty plain language, as I shall show by and by.

Well, then, suppose the present Ministry to continue: what is the situation in which Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. ATTWOOD, Mr. TENNYSON, and Mr. HARVEY have placed themselves? Mr. O'CONNELL must move for a repeal of the Coercion-Bill; Mr. ATTWOOD must move for an enlargement of the currency; Mr. TENNYSON must move for shortening the duration of Parliaments; Mr. HARVEY must move for the *ungentleman-like* inquiry into the pension-list. And what has Sir ROBERT PEEL to do, when these motions are made? Simply this, addressing Mr. HARVEY, for instance: "The honourable member made this same motion on such a day: our predecessors in office gave him such and such an answer; on these grounds, our predecessors rejected the motion of the honourable member: the honourable member has recently expressed *his confidence* in these our predecessors. We know that the honourable member would not do this, unless the conduct of those predecessors had received and merited his approbation. Ambitious, therefore, of succeeding to the approbation of the honourable member, we, in imitation of our predecessors, hesitate not to reject his motion!"

Why, my friends, this is easy work, indeed! The thing is as clear as daylight. Either the Whigs did right in rejecting Mr. HARVEY's motion, or they did wrong; if they did right, why does he renew the motion? If they did wrong, why does he support the Whigs, and want them back again into power? Aye, but the Tories are worse than the Whigs. I deem this to be a moral impossibility, because I believe that nothing in human shape is so bad. But, admitting that they may be worse in other respects, they cannot be worse, as far as relates to the case of Mr. HARVEY. They rejected his motion with disdain. The Tories may do the same, indeed, but they cannot do *more*; and so it is in all the other cases that I have supposed. So that these gentlemen, whose motions were rejected by

the Whigs, have provided for the Tories the best possible argument for their motions being rejected by them. If they meant, again, to bring forward these motions, they should not, by any vote given in this preliminary stage, have expressed their confidence in men, who, when in power, had rejected these very motions.

Far better would it have been for them to have voted for the Tories in these preliminary motions, for then they would not have stood pledged for confidence in men by whom those motions had been rejected. Messrs. WILKS, BAINES, and others, the advocates of the Dissenters, are just in the same situation; they have expressed their confidence in men who rejected the claims of the Dissenters; and, if they be willing to confide in one set of men, who really have rejected their claims, what complaint have they against another set of men who shall imitate those in whom they have expressed their confidence.

But, now let us see *what hopes the Radicals can have in the Whigs*. Towards the close of the debate on the Address, Mr. GISEBORNE, one of the members for Derbyshire (with what motive, God only knows!) observed, that he wished to see a Ministry made up by a junction between the Whigs, and such men as Mr. WARBURTON and Mr. GROTE, who were a sort of moderate Radicals; but Lord HOWICK, who spoke after this, took care most solemnly to *protest against any such junction*; and, indeed, Lord MORPETH, who moved the Amendment, said something to nearly the same amount, in answer to Lord SANDON, who had observed, that the Whigs must make a junction with the Radicals. So that there is not the smallest intention on the part of the Whig faction to form any such junction; and sorrowful will be the disappointment of all the patriotic place-hunters. Messrs. ATTWOOD, TENNYSON, HARVEY, GROTE, and the rest of that description of persons will bring forward their motions as before. These motions will, of course, be opposed by the Tories; and in this opposition the Whigs; the *grateful* Whigs; the sincere Whigs, will join the Tories, as the Tories joined

them, against the people. And how will these gentlemen who make the motions look, when they see that? Will they then boast of having beaten the Tories? Or will they look a little foolish, and think that they would have acted a wiser part if they had had *an amendment of their own*, and had both the parties to vote against them at once. By their support of the Whigs, in this case, and especially by their vote on the Address, they are become curs, lurking at the heels of the Whigs, who would kick them away with scorn, the moment they propose any one thing that the people want to have done.

It will not be many days before the sincerity of all parties will be put to the test. Mr. ATTWOOD, Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. TENNYSON; all the Radical supporters of the Whigs will vote for the *repeal of the malt-tax*. But, WILL THE WHIGS DO IT? Will these patriots vote for that repeal? Not one single man of them, and Lord JOHN RUSSELL, Mr. POULETT THOMSON, Mr. SPRING RICE, and the whole band, will join the Tories, and vote against that measure; and still saddle the millions of the people, if they can, with treble price for their drink, made out of the produce of their own soil! I beg you, my friends, to keep your eye upon the division on this subject. The motion is to be made by Lord CHANDOS next Tuesday night; and, if the Minister have but the wisdom to *give way* upon this question, the night closes upon the dastardly and perfidious Whigs for ever and ever. If he have not the wisdom to give way, he, with Lord JOHN RUSSELL, and all his tag-rag, is left in a minority. This is my real belief; and this, observe, puts the Whigs to the test; and puts to the test, also, the soundness of the judgment of those who, being Radicals, voted for the Whigs. When Mr. ATTWOOD, for instance, finds the faction whom he has now been supporting, voting against the repeal of this tax (and he assuredly will find them doing it), what will he say; how will he justify his vote in support of this faction? For my part, I can conceive nothing more embarrassing than this. Find fault of the horrible, perfidious faction, he cannot; for he has just

been supporting them, and endeavouring to get them back again into power. *Straight lines* are always *shortest*; and the straight line here was, not to assist one faction against the other; but to cast aside both the Address and the Amendment, and propose an Address of your own, against which both the parties would have joined. However, the event of Tuesday night will place all the parties in their proper light before the people. Great care must be taken to have the names of all the Whigs, and of their pretended Radical supporters; the names of all those who made part of the majority on the two great divisions, and who will now be found voting against a repeal of the malt-tax; and, I verily believe, that the greater part of the opponents of the repeal will be found amongst those *who supported the Whigs in carrying the amended Address*. This will be a nice fact for the people to be made acquainted with; and, in making them acquainted with it, nothing shall be wanting on the part of your faithful friend and representative,

And most obliged and obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

STOPPING THE SUPPLIES.

I HAVE come down here to try to get rid of a monstrous hoarseness, which I caught in haranguing the *pure* patriots of STAFFORD, in the county-hall in that town, for which haranguing Lord TALBOT and Lord SANDON, two magistrates of the county, gave leave to the pure people of that place. It being understood that it was my object to persuade them to choose Sir CHARLES WOLSELEY, on account of his public spirit and excellent character as a Staffordshire gentleman, while others were thought to be ready to give them considerable sums for their votes. This being understood, generally, I dare say the two noble lords were highly amused with the idea of my coming there to exercise my powers of moral conversion. I had the whole town assembled before me, male and female; and they so heartily cheered my expressions of reprobation of bribery and corruption; my texts from scripture to show that it was actually a

bond fide sale of their souls to the devil, that I really thought I had converted them; and, perhaps, if the Evangelists had been put to their lips, then and there, and without the sight of a bribe, or hearing the chink of the money, I might have succeeded to a considerable extent. But, alas! there were several days between the harangue and the election; and out of between twelve and fourteen hundred voters, Sir CHARLES WOLSELEY got only *twenty-nine*! So that I had my sweating, my cold, my cough, and my hoarseness, only to save these twenty-nine from the common fate of their townsmen; and, indeed, it is most probable that these were virtuous persons who wanted no haranguing from me, or from anybody else.

Brought down hither chiefly, at this time, by this hoarseness, which exposes me to the excruciating torment of sitting silent, at times when I am bursting to speak, in answer to what I will not here describe, but which, under such circumstances, would drive any other man out of his senses, I must now take my information from the newspapers, which tell me, that the long-made threat of *opposing the Supplies* was not put into execution. I think that there are about a hundred officers of the army and navy in the House, on full or half-pay. Add the relations of such who are in the House; add the pensioners, placemen, sinecurists, grantees, retired-allowance people; add pretty nearly a hundred bankers; add members with thumping shares in the funds; and then expect the House to stop the supplies: but, first, get provided for yourself a good comfortable lodging in Bedlam; for out of Bedlam you can express no such opinion, without exciting the ridicule of even the blackguard boys in the streets.

On the 2. instant a sort of explanation took place; a sort of questioning, in order to discover whether the present Ministers would quit their places, in consequence of the majorities against them. This questioning and answering became a very interesting matter; and from the tone of the parties, we may pretty safely conclude, that the Whigs are without any hope of getting at the loaves and fishes again, for

the present at any rate. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, you will find, had not the heart to attempt a stopping of the Supplies; and that, too, because if he had made the motion, he would have had a majority against him of ten to one. Oh, no! there has been no stopping of Supplies, since the Parliament created bands of usurers called fundholders, to swallow up the earnings of the people. This step, therefore, was always out of the question. The Mutiny Bill is now talked of, which is much about the same thing; and by the time that that bill has passed, my opinion is, that the ranks of the Whigs will have become so thin, as for the battalion to be perfectly despicable. I think that a great part of the Whigs will actually join the Tories, for what they deem their own safety's sake; and the rump of the Whigs will not form a party, such as used to exist in the time of Fox; for there is now a third party more powerful than they, and will be more and more powerful every day; so that the Whig faction will, in future, be a mere adjunct, or set of mercenary auxiliaries, bound to fight for the Tories, like *Swisses*. Just like them, fighting for the preservation of their pay. What a folly to suppose that the people were to get any thing out of this faction, which is all encrusted over with public property of one description or another. I will now insert the evening's talk, of which I spoke before. I beg the reader to go through it with care: he will see how completely the Whigs are chop-fallen; and he will see that they are making preparations for drawing off from the Radicals, who gave them their famous majorities. Tuesday night, will, however, settle the whole matter; and, the next day, we shall hear what the vile Whig papers will say about their "*black list*." The *real black list* will be that which will be found voting *against relieving the people*; voting, not about nonsense, but voting whether the millions of England and Wales, and also Scotland and Ireland, shall still be pressed to the earth, degraded and ruined, on the ground that their degradation and ruin are necessary to the support of "PUBLIC CREDIT"; seeming to take

it for granted, that the notorious insolvency of the great mass of farmers and of tradesmen is not to be considered as worthy of the slightest notice; taking it for granted, that their credit is not public credit. We shall see the names of those who will vote for the continuation of the ruin of the nation for the benefit of a band of usurers.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL rose to ask some question of the right hon. Baronet in respect to a dissolution of Parliament which it was rumoured it was the intention of his Majesty's Ministers to recommend, if the present House of Commons showed a disposition to adopt different measures from those brought forward. It has (said the noble Lord) called for measures of a more decided character than the Ministers had advised his Majesty to recommend in his speech from the throne, and the rumour is, that the only measure which was to be adopted is now considered to be unnecessary, though the Ministers felt that the late vote of the House was a censure upon them. (Hear, hear). I never knew any Ministry to stand with respect to the House of Commons in such an extraordinary situation before, and I thought it necessary to call the attention of the House, before we went into any committee of supply whatever, to the rumours which prevailed. I want to ask whether the right hon. Baronet has given any authority to these rumours—whether his Majesty's Ministers, having advised his Majesty to appeal to the sense of his people, will not be content, if the House is adverse to any views and measures brought forward by the right hon. Baronet—whether they will appeal again to the sense of the people, and endeavour to wear out and vex the country by repeated elections? There have been rumours of a more extraordinary nature—that, if we came to a case in which it should be thought advisable to dissolve the Parliament before the passing of the Mutiny Act, the right hon. Baronet would feel authorized in maintaining a standing army in a time of peace. (Hear, hear, and laughter from the Ministerial side).

I admit that the rumour is in itself absurd, and though it may have entered into the heads of some sanguine persons to advise his Majesty to such a course, a great deal of the force of such a suspicion is dispelled by the answer of his Majesty to the Address. After quoting that Address the noble Lord observed—Now, sir, I cannot believe that they (the Ministers) have given any such notice, or that they have a dissolution of Parliament at all in contemplation. I have, therefore, changed my mind on the subject, and shall not ask the question which on a former night I intimated to be my intention to propose to the right hon. Baronet opposite, when he should make his motion for the Supplies; but, judging from the answer that his Majesty has been graciously pleased to give to the amended Address, I infer that it is not the intention of Ministers to interrupt the House in the forwarding of those measures which they think necessary for the welfare of the state, and which, as the chief council of the nation, they may deem it conducive to its interests to offer. With regard to the general supplies, I do not intend, as I have before observed, to put any formal questions to the right hon. Baronet; but at the same time, while I refrain from doing so, I do think that we ought not to go into the details of that subject incautiously, or until, at least, full explanations are given by Ministers, after the success of the amended Address, of the course they intend to pursue. I do not agree with the honourable member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume), that his Majesty's answer, in reply to the amended Address, ought to have stated any thing definite as to the intention of Ministers regarding corporation and other reforms; but I am of opinion that they must state their intentions as to the measures of reform they promise to introduce; especially they are bound now to give those explanations, as the conversations which are rumoured to have recently taken place in the old Palace of Westminster tend to increase the doubts heretofore entertained of the sincerity of Ministers as to corporation reform, or that they wish to give to the people that control over their bodies that they formerly exercised, and that ought

to be, most indubitably, at once restored to them. (Hear, hear). My hon. and learned friend the member for Edinburgh (Sir John Campbell) has given a notice that in case the Government do not bring forward a measure of municipal reform, he shall propose a bill on the subject. I trust my honourable and learned friend will persevere in his motion, and that, whatever his Majesty's Ministers may do, he will carry into effect the wishes of the people. With regard to the question of the Irish church, the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Rob. Peel) stated, in answer to a question proposed to him on the first night's debate, that his Majesty's Ministers were determined to lay the report of the commissioners on the table of the House, but that they might not expect any thing from them in the way of a motion. Having made no motion on the subject, it is my intention, as soon as the report shall be laid on the table, to bring the question formally before the House. I shall then allude to the reforms which it was the intention of his Majesty's late Government to introduce. Having stated what our course will be upon these two questions, in order that the right hon. gentleman may answer the call which will, I should state, be made upon him, I shall now leave it to him to state the course the Government intend to pursue in the new and extraordinary circumstances in which it is placed.

Sir ROBERT PEEL then rose and said Sir, it is always my wish to give to the House as unreserved an explanation of the course which I mean to pursue as a public man as it is consistent with my duty as a Minister; and I do not require any stated time to give an answer to the questions of the noble Lord. (Cries of Hear, hear, hear). I have not felt it my duty, in consequence of the vote of the other night, to tender my resignation to his Majesty (loud cheering from the Ministerialists), and I do intend to persevere (renewed cheering) in that which I consider my duty, and which is, notwithstanding that vote, to submit to the consideration of the House those measures upon which his Majesty's Government have formed their opinions. Sir, I am aware that the House of Commons did, by

a small majority (loud cries of Hear, hear) in an especially full House—a majority of 309 to 302—not pass a censure on the King's Government, but did by that majority of seven imply a difference of opinion as to the necessity of a dissolution of Parliament, and an apprehension, which I think was unfounded, that measures which would be conducive to the general interest will be interrupted by the appeal which his Majesty has made to the sense of his people (Hear). But I did not believe that that majority which came to the vote on the subject of the Amendment did mean to imply an opinion that that vote was tantamount to a vote for the removal of his Majesty's Ministers. (Cries of Hear, hear). I know that there are many who concurred in that vote who will admit that I should have been acting inconsistently with my duty, if I considered that that vote implied an opinion that it was my duty to retire from the post to which his Majesty had called me. Some hon. Members voting for that Amendment declared that such was their opinion. With respect to the Irish church (for I shall take the several questions of the noble Lord in the order which their importance merits, not in the order in which they were put to me), I do intend to present to this House the report which may be made by the commissioners of public instruction appointed by the late Government. When I came into office, I ascertained that that commission had applied itself sedulously to the duties that had been pointed out to it. I ascertained that they had completed their inquiries in one-half the parishes of Ireland; that they were proceeding to make them in the others; and his Majesty's servants did not consider it consistent with their duty, the commission having been appointed by his Majesty, to interfere with the progress of it. On the contrary, without committing myself to the adoption of any of its sentiments, or the principle of any of the measures which it might propose, I do intend to lay the report upon the table of the House. The noble Lord has intimated an opinion that we would not found any measure upon the suggestions of this commission. The noble lord misapprehended me. What I

said was this, that I still remained of opinion that ecclesiastical property ought not to be diverted from actual ecclesiastical purposes. (Cheers). That was the principle which I always have maintained, and on which I am still disposed to act; but I did not preclude myself, by that declaration, from adopting any measures recommended by that commission, if I approved of them. (Hear). Before the subject of the corporation commission I know not to what conversations the noble Lord alluded. I speak only for myself; and I mean, when the report of the corporation commission shall be presented and concluded (which I hope it will be in a short time, as we were led to expect it at the conclusion of the last month), when that report and evidence shall be laid upon the table, I mean to give its suggestions and evidence my best consideration. I assure the noble Lord that I have no lurking prejudices in favour of the abuses of corporations. (Hear, hear). I cannot conceive how I can have any interest in maintaining the abuses of corporations; on the contrary, I can feel that both I and the public have a deep interest in putting an end to those abuses; but it would be inconsistent with my duty as a Minister of the Crown, looking at the report of the committee of 1833, of which you, sir (addressing the Speaker) was chairman, and which stated that the remedies suggested would suit small corporations, but would not suit great ones, and that the most popular corporations were not the most pure, I should not be enabled to form a sound conclusion as to the most natural course I ought to pursue, until I have an opportunity of seeing the report of the commissioners, of weighing the evidence, and of ascertaining what abuses really exist. I have the honour of presiding over a corporation, and I am sure they will give their unanimous assent, if the result of the commission prove that abuses exist, to any improvement that should be suggested; and I trust that I am not committing any dereliction of the trusts confided in me when I say, that on the part of my own corporation there is a general disposition to concur in the same course. I am sure that the noble Lord will scarcely charge

me with any intention of blinding corporation reform. I repeat, I have no interest in doing so; my only wish is that I should know the nature and extent of the remedy before I commit myself to it. (Hear, hear). With respect to the last, but in point of fact the most important question with which I was threatened on a former day, but from which the noble Lord has now receded (loud cheers from the Ministerial benches), it is possible in the interval the noble Lord may have referred to a question put in April, 1831, to Lord Grey. There were then rumours very prevalent of an intention to dissolve Parliament, and with good reason, for the question was put on the 21. of April, and on the 22. Parliament was dissolved. (Loud laughter). Lord Wharncliffe then said that as allusion had been made to the subject he wished to ask the noble Lord (Grey) whether there was any truth in those rumours, and whether the noble Lord had advised his Majesty to dissolve Parliament. Earl Grey in answer said, "That he believed the question was one of a very unusual nature (great cheering from the Ministerial benches), and he could hardly bring himself to believe when the question was put by the noble Lord that he expected an answer." I will be more explicit. The noble Lord has asked me whether or not I have countenanced rumours that are prevalent respecting an intended dissolution of Parliament, and I answer that by no act or expression of mine, either directly or indirectly given, have I given any sanction to such rumours; and I also add, that I never even put a case hypothetically in which such a dissolution would be justifiable. It is only respectful to the House that I should state this; nothing would be more unbecoming in me than to hold out any menace to this House in consequence of any course which this House may think fit to pursue. Another rumour referred to by the noble Lord was, that we are to govern by means of standing armies, in case the House of Commons should refuse to vote the supplies, or to pass the Mutiny Act. (Tremendous laughter). I trust this rumour is of recent origin, as I declare that the first time I ever heard a whisper of it was

from the lips of the noble Lord. There was another question with which I was threatened the other day, but which the noble Lord has not put to-day, viz., whether or not I should pledge myself to the House that his Majesty's prerogative respecting the dissolution of Parliament should not be exercised. It would be unbecoming of me, as one of the Ministers of the Crown, to place any of the prerogatives of the Crown in abeyance. (Loud cheers). As a privy councillor, and adviser of the Crown, I have never advised the exercise of this prerogative. To the extent to which I have gone I venture to anticipate that my answer to the noble Lord will be satisfactory. (Cheers).

LORD JOHN RUSSELL: I did not mean that the right hon. Baronet was to govern by a standing army. What I meant was that there were rumours abroad that the right hon. Baronet would consider himself justified in keeping up the army, though there was no Mutiny Bill in existence. (Hear).

MR. SPRING RICE inquired whether it was the intention of the present Government to make any alteration in the system of education established in Ireland by the late Ministers.

SIR HENRY HARDINGE replied that it was not the intention of the present Government to make any alteration in that system; but he would take that opportunity of stating that the estimate for that purpose would be larger this year than it was during last.

MR. HUMPHREY asked whether, notwithstanding the majorities against Ministers—notwithstanding the feeling of that House against them—and, consequently, notwithstanding public opinion, which the majority of that House represented, the right hon. Baronet and his colleagues intended to persevere in maintaining their places, in the face of repeated majorities against them, and in spite of the voice of the nation. (Cries of Oh, oh). Would they still persevere in retaining their places notwithstanding all these demonstrations of public opinion against them? We have a right (continued the hon. Gentleman) to expect a steady, straight-forward answer; and my question is, whether I understood the right hon.

Baronet correctly, that, notwithstanding the majority of this House being decidedly against him and his colleagues, it is his intention to persevere; or whether he doubts the opinion already expressed to be the opinion of the majority of this House? I should be very glad to know, because the right hon. Baronet must see that the people of England have no means of stating their opinions but through their representatives in this House; and if the opinions of their representatives are to be set at nought and at defiance, I do not know what unpleasant consequences may arise. (Hear, hear, hear). It may bring about a collision with the other House, which it is extremely desirable to avoid. (Hear, hear). It is contrary to almost all precedents, although it is perfectly well known that William Pitt continued in office under similar circumstances for a considerable time, but certainly during that time the people out of doors were eventually with Mr. Pitt. (Cheers from the Ministerial side). That is not the case now (laughter, and cheers from the opposition); although I have no doubt there are hon. Members on the other side of the House who are under that delusion. (Continued laughter and cheering). I am sure I speak as far as regards my own constituents. (Cries of Oh, oh). Aye, I will say three out of four. I have not the smallest hesitation in saying that three out of four in the county of Middlesex are against the present Government, and I therefore do hope that the right hon. Baronet will, with his usual frankness, answer my questions; first, whether he considers the decisions that have taken place do not show a majority of the people against him, or whether he intends to wait for a future period in order to try the strength of the House.

Sir R. PEEL: When I answered the question put to me by the noble Lord I stated a simple fact, namely, that in consequence of the vote the other night I had not considered it my duty to tender my resignation, and I do assure the honourable gentleman, that in my situation I find it quite sufficient to dispose of the practical questions that are put to me (cheers from the Ministerial benches), without meeting

the hypothetical points to which the hon. gentleman asks for an answer. I have not resigned, and I mean to proceed in the execution of my duty, and submit to the consideration of Parliament those measures which the Government have decided upon. (Cheers from the opposition). But with respect to the course which I intend to pursue, until the measures are actually brought before the consideration of the House, on that question I cannot pronounce an opinion.

Mr. HUME: I regret I cannot make myself understood to the right hon. Baronet. The right hon. Baronet speaks hypothetically, but I speak an actual fact. The right hon. Baronet was in a minority on the Address to the Crown, an actual majority of this House being against him, and a large majority out of the House being against him. (No, no). Such might not be the case with the constituencies of some honourable gentlemen, but for his own he would say, nine out of ten did not place confidence in the Government of the right hon. gentleman. Now those were actual facts, and admitted of no hypothesis at all. If the right hon. gentleman is balancing between two courses, I have no doubt that the right honourable gentleman finds great difficulty how he is to proceed. I think, however, that we ought to know what we are to do, for since the question now before the House is a matter of supply, it becomes us to be fully acquainted with the proceedings of those who demand them. Others might be merely matters of form; this is a case preparatory to granting the Supplies; and if we are told that the present Ministry, not enjoying the confidence of the people, are to maintain their places, for they cannot carry on the Government, it is for us to consider whether or no we should be right were we to place at the disposal of his Majesty and his Majesty's Ministers any supply whatever. (Hear, hear). Anything that curbs the prerogative of the Crown is extremely dangerous, and ought not to be resorted to on any occasion except on the greatest emergency; but if, after public opinion has been expressed in this manner, we commit our supplies to the present Ministry, I should like to know whose fault it is. I do not think that the

majority of the House of Commons are to be treated in direct defiance, and I should therefore like to ask the right honourable baronet the actual fact, and not hypothetically.

Sir R. PEEL: I really appeal to the House whether I have shown any reluctance to answer any question. The House of Commons came to a division the other night on the Address by a majority of 309 to 302 against Ministers. I have said, looking at that majority, that I did not feel it my duty to abandon my place on this occasion. If the honourable Member thinks that he ought to put himself in direct opposition before he understands what Ministers intend doing, I shall then know how to proceed. It would be quite out of my power to answer the question of the honourable Gentleman before I know the actual feeling of the House with respect to the measures intended to be proposed by the Government.

Mr. HUME—I ask the right hon. Baronet whether he thinks that the late vote against the Ministry be a vote of confidence or want of confidence in them? It was stated by the friends of the right hon. Baronet as being a direct display of want of confidence.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, on looking to the vote, he did not think it had decided that it was his duty to retire.

Mr. EWART would ask the right hon. Baronet if he thought the vote was not a censure upon Ministers? (Hear, hear).

Sir ROBERT PEEL: I can construe the Address, and I can construe the answer to the Address; but I leave it to those who voted for the Amendment to construe their own course of conduct. (Cheers and laughter from the Ministerial side).

Mr. C. BARCLAY said it had been stated that the majority of the people out of doors agreed with those that carried the Amendment. Now, as representing a very large body of the people, he would deny that statement; at least the balance would be found to be quite as nice out of doors as within that House. During his canvass he never heard any lamentations for the loss of the late Ministry. (Cheers from the Ministerial side). He found the people out of doors to consist either of Conservatives or Destructives. (Laughter).

If the hon. member for Middlesex would try the question by a motion, either condemnatory or commendatory of the late Ministers, he would find that there would be no majority either one way or the other. (Hear and laughter.)

Major BEAUCLERK thought the House was travelling away from the real question before it, though he could say with justice and truth he had no confidence in Ministers, as they did not go far enough to satisfy him. (Hear, hear). At the same time he was willing to vote for so much of the Supplies as would enable them to go on: he would not throw any impediment in the way of their bringing forward their measures. It was of little consequence whether the Government was Whig, Tory, or Radical, provided the measures introduced by the Government were good. If the Ministers could not make up their minds to bring forward any satisfactory measures he could not support them; but if they did he would be bound to do so. He thought the attacks which had been made on both sides of the House were not likely to be productive of any good. (Hear). He should only vote for a certain supply, that Ministers might have an opportunity of bringing before the House their measures; but if those measures were not satisfactory he should feel it his duty to stop the Supplies. (Hear, hear).

Mr. O'CONNELL: The right hon. Baronet has said something with regard to the temporalities of the Irish church, which I understood him to say are to be applied to ecclesiastical purposes. I wish to know if I am to understand them to be limited to the purposes of the established church?

Sir R. PEEL: I am bound to state that it is confined to purposes connected with the doctrines of the established church. (Hear, hear). In a short time the report of the commissioners will be laid before the House, and I submit whether it is not premature to discuss these details at present.

Mr. O'CONNELL: I did not mean to excite any discussion, nor do I think my question is calculated to do so.

Sir R. PEEL rose and said, I beg leave to make a motion which some gentlemen

may not be prepared for, and to which other gentlemen may attribute motives that have really no foundation. It is with the greatest satisfaction that I have the honour to propose that Mr. Bernal should take the chair as Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means. (Immense cheering from all sides of the House). I protest against misconstruction of my motives. What might have been the fate of another proposition I will not now inquire. (Cheers and laughter from the opposition). It is enough for me that I am for the present — (Laughter). Honourable members may laugh and cheer, but I can say with truth that I never contemplated any other appointment (cheers); for I have witnessed with pleasure the great impartiality with which the honourable Gentleman has presided in the chair; and there are many present who can bear me out in my assertion that I never had any other proposition to make. If the House is unanimous in calling that hon. Gentleman to the chair, it will, in my opinion, be only paying him the compliment to which he is justly entitled. (Great cheering).

LORD JOHN RUSSELL said he rose merely for the purpose of bearing his testimony to the fact that Mr. Bernal was now only reaping the advantages which his strict impartiality and gentlemanly behaviour in the chair had justly entitled him to at the hands of the House. (Cheers).

MR. BERNAL then went and took the chair, amidst the most enthusiastic cheering.

The honourable Member then read (*pro forma*) the paragraph of his Majesty's Speech which was addressed to the House of Commons. He then put the question, "That a supply be granted to his Majesty," which passed without comment, and was reported to the House.

THE RATHCORMAC AFFAIR.

MR. H. GRATTAN said that he did not wish to excite any debate on the motion of which he had given notice on a former evening, respecting the melancholy affair of Rathcormac. (Hear, hear). If the right hon. Gentleman opposite, (Sir H. Hardinge) would consent to the produc-

tion of the letter of the noble Lord from the Horse Guards, he (Mr. G.) should abstain from making any observations on the subject.

SIR H. HARDINGE was obliged to the hon. Member for the course he pursued; but as to the letter of the noble Lord, much misapprehension was abroad as to the purport of it. All it said respecting the melancholy affair in question was the approval of the conduct of the military for acting in obedience to the orders of the magistracy, but not one word did it contain of approbation as to how they acted on that occasion. He (Sir H. Hardinge) did not certainly know how it came into the public newspapers, and if his explanation was not satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman opposite, he would refer him to Bristol and to other places, in which instances it was always a practice of the Government to congratulate the military for the services which they rendered. (Hear, hear).

MR. O'CONNELL said, without participating in the motion, he hoped the letter would be laid on the table, and from the explanation which the right hon. Baronet had given, and as the question was still *sub judice*, he hoped that no discussion would take place. The explanation which had been given, until replied to, if it ever should, would have all the weight it deserved.

SIR JOHN BYNG, without desiring to provoke a discussion, would wish to know what would justify the expression of "forbearance" contained in the noble Lord's letter of congratulation to the military.

MR. LITTLETON defended the late Government from the responsibility imposed upon them respecting this affair; neither it nor the present Government were chargeable for any blame on this subject. (Hear, hear). After a few observations from the right hon. Gentleman, the motion was agreed to, and the House adjourned.

STATE OF AGRICULTURE.

AFTER all, this is the most important matter; for, though farmers do not clamour; though they make little noise, if they be broken up, there must be what is

generally called a "revolution," in England; that is to say, a convulsive movement, which will cause property to change hands to a very great extent, openly, visibly, and by force. Men may dream about prosperity in manufactures, and in trade; but if the tillage of the land becomes unprofitable, even without any rent at all, what is to become of any branch of the nation's concerns? I will first insert a table, taken from the public prints, of the price of wheat throughout Great Britain; and then I will pursue my remarks.

WHEAT.	Per Qr.	
	s.	s.
Glasgow	40	a 52
Edinburgh	38	52
Bristol	36	44
Newcastle	33	42
Sunderland	36	42
Alnwick	32	26
Hexham	32	40
Morpeth	33	38
Gainsborough	38	46
Maidstone	40	48
Haddington	39	48
Carlisle	40	46
Penrith	40	46
Leeds	36	50
Wisbeach	42	50
Sheffield	40	42
Lynn	34	40
Stamford	34	42
Boston	36	42
Spalding	36	40
Sleaford	40	44
Uppingham	34	39
Exeter	52	56
Gloucester	48	56
Newbury	45	52
Reading	30	52
Salisbury	42	52
Shepton Mallet	39	44
Sherborne	42	48
Taunton	35	43
Andover	30	48
Basingstoke	50	61
Bath	40	55
Bridgwater	40	46
Cirencester	34	42
Lincoln	32	40
Derby	40	43
Nottingham	40	44
Newark	38	44

Northampton	35	a 39
Peterborough	33	41
Chesterfield	42	48
Grantham	35	38
Blandford	40	45
Warminster	44	56
Wantage	46	59
Yeovil	44	56
Brigg	36	40
Long Sutton	32	38
Huntingdon	34	44
Oakham	40	48
East Retford	44	53
Devizes	32	46
Chard	42	46
Horncastle	35	38
Louth	37	42
Spilsby	36	40
Grimsby	37	42
Caistor	34	45
Cumberland	40	48
Westmoreland	40	46
Lancashire	40	48
Cheshire	40	46
Durham	38	45
Yorkshire	40	46

Here is an average price of wheat throughout the kingdom of Great Britain, of forty-two shillings and one penny the quarter; that is to say, five shillings and the fraction of a farthing the bushel; but the reader will observe, that the *farmer* does not get this much. It is the price that wheat will sell for when arrived in Mark Lane, or on the wharfs at GLASGOW, or in other large places where there is great consumption; and the best judge of these matters that I have ever known in my life, thinks that an average of four shillings and sixpence is as much as the farmer gets. Fat hogs, in the counties that I am acquainted with, are selling for five shillings a score; that is to say, three-pence a pound. These prices are lower than those of 1822. The *measure* of corn had not been then, for the sake of gratifying a gang of Scotch jobbers augmented in capacity by that beastly bill, which cost the nation more than a million of money, which is now costing every county two or three hundred a year in maintaining a jobber to superintend these weights and measures; so that the bushel is now larger than it was then, to gratify

the greedy and scabby wretches before-mentioned. By the by, we owe this measure in great part, if not in toto, to the scientific and economical Mr. JOSEPH HUME, who here wasted a couple of millions of money, at the least, on a thing that could never, by possibility, be of any use.

But, to return, fat hogs were eight shillings a score in 1822; so that farm-produce is now greatly less in price than it was then. It is less in price by a fourth, or a fifth, at least, than it was last year; and it must go on, coming down lower and lower, till an arable farm, rent-free, will be a burden. And, is Sir ROBERT PEEL going to carry on the Government upon the principle, or rather, upon the opinion, that the distress of agriculture arises from the "pressure of local charges"; and that all farmers, landlords, and tradesmen, may be insolvent, and that a nation may be sustained, and great and flourishing, in spite of their ruin, so long as the fundholders have their interest duly paid in full. If these be the opinions and principles upon which he intends to carry on the Government; and if he be permitted to attempt to carry it on for two years longer, this nation must be revolutionized; most likely, the Government totally destroyed, and an American Government established in its stead. It is impossible to collect fifty millions of taxes a year with wheat at four and sixpence a bushel, without producing a revolution in the kingdom.

[MR. COBBETT'S SPEECH,

AND THE OTHER SPEECHES ON HIS MOTION FOR AN ABOLITION OF THE MALT-TAX.

My readers are aware that I have, for many years, contended that this tax was the most mischievous thing existing in the country; and, being in Parliament, they would naturally expect that I should do my utmost to get it repealed and abolished. I did my utmost, during the last session of Parliament; and I am now about to lay before my readers in general, and my constituents in particular, an ac-

count of what has been done, as to this matter, during the present session of Parliament, and particularly the part which I have taken in the discussions relative to it.

On the 27. Feb. Sir William Ingilby made a motion for the House to go into a committee of the whole House, to consider whether there ought to be a repeal, partial and entire, of this mischief-doing tax. I spoke upon that occasion, against the further continuance of the tax; but I did not vote, because the motion was not direct, and because it was not positive as to a repeal of the whole of the tax. There was, upon that occasion, a division, when there were 170 for the motion, and 271 against it.

Things standing thus, and I, seeing the ground all forestalled until the 27. of May, gave notice that I would make a motion on that day, for a repeal of the whole of that tax; but, upon further consideration, I withdrew that notice, and fixed the notice for a similar motion on the 17. of March, to be made upon the motion for the House to go into a committee of supply. My motion was, "*Resolved, that it is expedient, that from and after the 5. of October next, all the duties on malt shall cease and determine.*" This motion I made on the 17. of March; and this motion was decided in the manner hereafter to be described. It would be irksome to myself, as well as to my readers, for me to be in the habit of reporting my own speeches in the *Register*; but, this is a subject of such vast importance, that I gave as correct a report as I could of the speech made upon this occasion, and also an analysis of what other gentlemen said in the same debate. I have here put the speeches one after the other, just as they occurred, giving them all with as much accuracy as my memory will enable me to do it, with the assistance of the reports in the newspapers.

Mr. COBBETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a motion to the House, for the total repeal of the malt-tax, which motion is in the following words: "Resolved, that it is expedient that from and after

"the 5. of October next, all the duties on malt shall cease and determine."

Certainly, sir, such a motion ought not to be submitted to the House, without reasons given for the measure of which it proposes the adoption; and yet, to give those reasons will require the consumption of a much larger portion of the time of the House, than I shall like to call upon it to bestow; but, when duty bids me to proceed, and reluctance to occupy the time of the House would draw me back, I feel myself under the necessity of obeying the former.

Before I proceed to the reasons which I deem more than sufficient for the total repeal of this tax, it is my duty to endeavour to remove two very gross and mischievous errors, which, from what we have heard recently in this House, appear to me to be generally prevalent throughout the country; or, at least, amongst almost the whole of those who are prominent in discussing political affairs.

The first of these errors is, that the landlords, the farmers, and all the persons immediately concerned in the cultivation of the land, would be exclusively benefited by the repeal of these duties; and that the inhabitants of towns are very little interested in the matter; that they have an interest in the repeal of the house and window-tax, but that they have scarcely any interest at all in the repeal of this tax; that the tax being taken off, the honourable Member for Bridport recently told us, would only be so much money put into the pockets of the landlords, who would be the sole persons that would gain by the change.

An error so monstrous as this, has scarcely ever found its way into the human mind. What, sir! do not the people in towns, and, particularly, the hard-working people in towns, drink beer? And, is not their beer made of malt, as well as the beer of the country-people? The fact is, that the repeal of the malt-tax would be greatly more beneficial to the tradesmen and workmen in towns, than the repeal of the house and window-tax, both put together. Seldom do working-people pay any part of the house-tax or window-tax; but the malt-tax lies heavily on them all, causing their beer,

which is absolutely necessary to them, to cost more than twice as much as it would cost if there were no tax upon malt. Further, nineteen-twentieths of the tradesmen, though they may pay from three pounds to twelve pounds a year, on account of house and window-tax, pay, on an average, a great deal more on account of the malt-tax.

This gross error is, then, backed up by another, if possible still more gross; namely, that the persons owning, occupying, labouring upon, and deriving their subsistence out of, the land, are a mere nothing in number, compared with those who are employed in manufactures, trade, and commerce, and, especially, in manufactures. The right honourable Member for Manchester has called upon us to thank God, that England was the great manufacturing shop of the world; the noble Lord, who is one of the representatives of the West Riding of Yorkshire, calls those who are hostile to the corn-laws, the body of the people; the honourable Member for Middlesex has told us, that this is now a manufacturing nation, and that England was poor before it was a manufacturing nation. I wish, sir, that the honourable Member for Middlesex had drawn a little upon his store-house of knowledge, and had named the time when England was poor, and when she was not a manufacturing nation. I state, sir, without fear of contradiction from that honourable Member or any other, that England was always the richest, and always the most manufacturing nation in the world.

The ground-work of this great error, with regard to the number engaged in the different pursuits, are and have been for many years, the population returns, laid before this House, which, by reckoning all persons as manufacturers, traders, &c., except the mere occupiers and workers upon the land; that is to say, except the mere husbandmen, the ploughmen, the reapers, the mowers, the thrashers, and woodmen; by considering all these as not belonging to agriculture, have led to the conclusion that the husbandmen and all belonging to the land, are a mere handful, compared with the rest of the community. I can give an instance with

regard to the village of BOTLEY, a village in Hampshire, with which I am well acquainted. The return states, that there are fifty-five families belonging to agriculture, forty-four to manufactures, trade, &c., and thirty-five of all other sorts. Now I take upon me to assert, that there is not a soul in that parish, who is not either husbandman, miller, or tanner; the miller to grind the corn; the tanner to dress the hides; or, parson or doctor: the parson collects the great and small tithes of the parish, and he lives upon them; the doctor bleeds and sets the bones of the husbandmen; and as to other sorts of persons, there are none, who are not employed in purchasing the produce of the land, or in selling clothing or other necessities, to those who raise that produce.

To the parishes of THURSLEY and WHITLEY, in Surrey, are ascribed eighty-three families, engaged in trade, manufactures, commerce, &c. If the hon. Member for West Surrey were in his place, who lives in one of those parishes, which are united by law, I would ask him, what sort of manufacture these eighty-three families carry on; from what foreign country they receive the raw material upon which they work; to what foreign country they export the produce of their looms or their other ingenious contrivances? Sir, these returns make up a mass of fallacies such as never were before heard of in the world: in these two parishes, there is not a single soul (except, perchance, there may be a fundholder or two) who is not either husbandman, wheelwright, blacksmith, carpenter, butcher, or who does not follow some pursuit or other, immediately connected with the land; not a soul who could live upon the spot for a week, if there were no produce arising out of the produce of the land of those two parishes.

But, sir, there is one instance which is quite conclusive as to this point; and the matter can be settled at once, by only three words from an hon. Member whom I see sitting on the opposite benches. There is a parish in Surrey called Wanborough, and the return tells us that it contains twenty families chiefly employed in agriculture, and one family chiefly employed in commerce, manufactures, &c. Now, sir, there sits the hon. Member for Guildford, in Surrey; he is the sole proprietor of all the houses and all the land in that parish of Wanborough; and I call upon him to have the goodness to tell us whether this family of manufacturers have any connexion with foreign parts, whether their manufacture consists in making or new laying of ploughshares for his farms, and of shoes for the horses which work upon those farms? Short-sighted, indeed, must that man be, who cannot see far enough to know, that these manufacturers are husbandmen in fact, just as much as those who plough and reap and mow and thrash out the corn. Yet these ridiculous fallacies have led to the mischievous conclusions which we have heard in this House; they have misled the right hon. Member for Manchester. He tells us, that there are nine hundred thousand families only, belonging to the land, while there are fourteen hundred thousand families belonging to manufactures and trade.

The hon. Member for Marybonne has frequently asserted the great populousness of the borough which he has the honour to represent; and, when speaking of what he has been pleased to call the oppressions of the corn-laws, he has invariably represented his numerous constituents as having an interest distinct and independent, relative to the part of the community, immediately and obviously concerned in the land. The returns tell us, that there are, in the borough of MARYBONNE, a hundred and forty-three persons, chiefly employed in agriculture; that is to say, in the gardens and the hay-fields, which lie on the out-skirts of the borough or parish; but is this all? I verily believe, that I speak very far within compass, when I say that there are a thousand families; and I think I might say, thousands of families, all the males of which are employed, and solely employed, in making and selling ploughs, harrows, drags, drills, chaff-cutters, butter-churns, cheese-presses, spades, prongs, rakes, sieves, locks, and other implements, tools and necessities for husbandry. Were there no husbandry, these people would not be in the borough of Marybonne;

and were the land to produce nothing to send up rents into the fine streets and the squares, what would become of the tradesmen of Marybone? And look, sir, over the whole of this metropolis; look at the seedsmen, the salesmen of meat, the lightermen that bring up the corn, the multitudes whose centre is at Mark-lane; the hop-merchants and their people; look at all these, and imagine, if you can, the extent of the madness, or, rather, the blindness and absurdity of those who would attempt to designate any part of the people as not having an interest in agriculture.

But, if these gentlemen will insist upon the separation, I will face them, even with the admission of their own absurdity to be sense; and I will take the statement contained in the summary of even these fallacious returns. What says this summary? why this: that the male occupiers and labourers in agriculture, twenty years of age and upwards, are *one million and seventy-five thousand*; and that male persons of the same age engaged in manufactures, &c., are *three hundred and twenty thousand*.

Thus, then, if I were to adopt that erroneous view of the matter, according to which the malt-tax is considered as a burden to nobody but persons belonging to agriculture, I should say that there were three for one, at any rate, and that therefore they were worthy of our particular consideration. I, however, scout this idea as unworthy of the mind of a man of sense: I say that all are equally interested; and as such I must speak of them as likely to be benefited by the adoption of the measure which I have had the honour to propose to the House. In stating the reasons which I have to offer for the adoption of that measure, I must first observe, that I do not object to the tax on account of any partiality of pressure which it has; because I am fully aware, that every tax, lay it where you will, finds its way, first or last, to every person in the community. I must further observe, that I do not object to the tax on account of its money-weight; because, if the tax be wanted to carry on the affairs of the Government; and if it be collected at something near the ordinary expense

of collection, and being unproductive of any mischiefs beyond those arising out of its mere burden, money-burden, it would be improper to propose its repeal. But, sir, if a tax be, as I contend this tax is, peculiar as to its expenses of collection; and if it be productive of great moral evils, then it ought not to remain, even if a property-tax or poll-tax were necessary to be imposed in its stead; and I think myself capable of proving to the House, that this tax is of this description, and that therefore it ought to be repealed. I beg it to be observed, that I urge not the repeal as peculiarly beneficial to the landlord or the farmer. As consumers of malt, they would share in the benefit with the rest of the community; as great sufferers from the immoralities produced by this tax, they would certainly derive an extraordinary degree of benefit; but in this benefit the rest of the community must necessarily share, though their share might not be so obvious. It is impossible for the morals of millions of working-people to be mended without the effect being felt in every part and by every person of the community.

The first objection to this tax is, the extraordinary expense of collecting and managing it. I hold in my hand a statement, which I received last year from a gentleman at Nottingham, many years in the excise; and he proves, to my satisfaction, that five-sixths of the expenses of the whole of the excise establishment may be fairly ascribed to the malt-tax. Now, I have no means immediately at hand for ascertaining how much the whole of the expenses of the excise establishment is annually. At a guess I should say it amounted to a million of money or more; so that, to begin with, here is a million to be paid out of five millions and a half, before the money comes into the Exchequer. I believe this to be the fact; but the noble Lord can correct me here, if I be in error. At any rate, we know that the expense is very great; much greater than the collection of any other tax or taxes, to three times the gross amount; and, therefore, this is a good objection to the tax. In the case of the stamps, for instance, all that the people pay goes into the Exchequer, except a mere trifle, com-

paratively speaking. The six millions cost only 168,000*l.* in the collection and management, while here are five millions and a half cost, as I believe, pretty nearly or quite a million in the collection and management. The second and still greater objection is, the monopoly which the tax necessarily gives rise to. Upon the same authority, which I have just mentioned, I state to the House these astounding facts; that, taking barley at twenty-eight shillings a quarter, and suppose four millions of quarters, which is about the quantity, the amount of such barley would be five millions six hundred thousand pounds; that eight quarters of barley make nine quarters of malt, and that this increase pays all the expenses of malting. So that the four millions of quarters of barley made into malt, would, were it not for the tax, cost the people five millions six hundred thousand pounds in the year; that the duty, added to this, would make the cost nine millions seven hundred thousand pounds a year; but that, in consequence of the monopoly, created by the tax, the malt, before the result of it reaches the lips of the people, either by private brewing or public brewing, does cost the people fourteen millions four hundred thousand pounds a year, instead of costing them five millions six hundred thousand pounds a year. When, a few evenings ago, I stated the price of malt at 8*s.* a bushel, an hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets produced a Mark-lane account, showing, that large quantities of it had been sold that week at about six and sixpence a bushel; but I spoke of the price of malt as I could get it for my use. The tax enables men with large capital to get the malt at a price at which men for private brewing cannot get it. And here I beg leave to refer to a part of the evidence taken before the beer-shop committee of last year. Mr. GOODLAKE, a magistrate of Berkshire, stated to the committee, that there was a beer-shop set up by a very respectable man in his own parish; that this man bought his beer of a brewer, until the beer which he brewed himself should have attained a proper age; and that then he sold his own beer:—"But the brewer thought it so good a thing that he set

" up another beer-shop in the parish;
" and he can brew it so much cheaper
" than the publican who has to go to a
" *dealer in malt and buy it at 9*s.* 6*d.**
" *a bushel, when the brewer can make it*
" *at about 6*s.* 3*d.*, that the publican*
" *cannot compete with him*; and the
" second beer-house being set up, the
" man that set up the other was obliged
" to give it up after the first twelvemonth,
" and to leave the brewer's beer-house in
" the parish."

Mr. EDWARD GREEN, who is a maltster, but also a farmer, of WARGRAVE, in Berkshire, gave the committee this information: "If there is so much advantage attending brewing, how is it that the *ale-houses sell brewers' beer*?—There are very few of them that have capital enough to buy their malt at the first hand; I could now furnish malt at 6*s.* 3*d.* a bushel; and our poor people, if they go to buy malt retail of a maltster are charged 8*s.* 6*d.*"

Mr. STOCK, a brewer of Essex, gave the following information: "What is the cost of your malt to you?—*Fifty-two shillings a quarter, covering every expense.*" —What have you given for your barley?—The highest price of our barley has been 30*s.* to 35*s.*, and the lowest is 24*s.*"

But, after all, no one stated any of the grounds for believing that this monopoly arose directly out of the tax. One of its effects, however, I will state to the House. The malt-duty is paid in every six weeks. A man possessed of apparent great means can obtain bondsmen, to a certain amount, for the payment of the duty; and in this case, the collector permits the maltster to be three collections in arrear, while the maltster with small means is compelled to pay up. The man who has the benefit of the first, is enabled to enter largely into business, and the greater his duty the more he injures society in the end. In numerous instances, these large maltsters have been known to crush the little ones entirely; and thus it is that the malt-houses, formerly so numerous, are now become comparatively very few in number. I remember, that at Stow-in-the-Wold I learned, that formerly there were fourteen malt-houses,

and that now there is only one. In the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, there used to be a malt-house in almost every village. The monopoly created by this tax has demolished, perhaps, nineteen out of every twenty. Large brewers are also maltsters. The monopolists, in fact, carry on their trade with *public money*: they have always two collections in their hands to carry on their trade with: so that the people are placed at their mercy, and so placed, too, by the use of the people's own money, which they have paid for the services of the state, and which is allowed to be kept in the hands of these monopolists. It is not, then, the tax itself, but the evils that arise out of the tax at every step that it takes; and here, on account of this monopoly alone, the people pay, as I have, I think, very clearly shown, four millions, seven hundred thousand pounds a year; which is an evil, an injustice, an oppression, arising entirely out of the tax. If I be asked, what is to become of all the capital now employed by these monopolists in this way, I answer, in the first place, that it is the people's capital in great part, as I have just shown; and, in the next place, if the monopolists have any capital, which is really their own, there is the land, there is lawful commerce; there are plenty of honest means for the profitable employment of this capital.

The third objection to this tax is, that it prevents people, and particularly the poorer part of the people, from brewing beer in their own houses, and thereby drives them to beer-shops, and other places of resort, for the purpose of getting beer; a drink which they ought to have, which they always have had, and which, let gentlemen think or say or do what they may, they always will have. I know it has been contended, that the poorer sort of people have been so long out of the habit of brewing at their own houses, that they would not take to it again, even if this tax were taken off, and if they could get the malt for a mere trifle, as they then would. It is a great mistake to suppose that this is one of the cases in which habit becomes second nature. In morals and in manners, there is great submission to the power of habit. Early

rising, late rising, sobriety, drunkenness, love of ease, love of activity; in these and numerous other instances, habit has a great deal to do in determining the conduct of men; but, when you come to eating and drinking, when you come to the means of providing a bellyful, the case is wholly different. When you are withheld from any natural enjoyment by force, you return to it the moment the force is removed. From having constantly a plenty to eat, you may, by compulsion, be confined to a quarter of a meal, for years together; but when the full meal returns, you instantly take it, without consideration had of the small quantity of food upon which you have recently lived. For a long time the labourers have been compelled to do without the bits of bacon in their pot; but, does any man imagine, that if they had the bits of bacon again they would not boil them and eat them? But it is said, that they want the utensils for brewing; said, indeed, only by those who cannot know any thing at all about the matter. It was asked, by the committee of last year, whether the utensils could not be had for a few shillings? There are no utensils wanting, but those which they have. A gallon of malt can be brewed in a porridge-pot which will hold five gallons of water; and twelve quarts of good beer I have seen made out of a gallon of malt in that very way. It is a great mistake to suppose that there requires large quantities of malt to be brewed together, in order to get the greatest proportion of strength. Malt is, in this respect, like tea: whether you put little or much of the latter into the pot, you get all the strength out of it in one case as well as in the other, and it is strong or weak in proportion to the quantity of water as compared with the quantity of tea. As to the expense, in the case of the labourer, it is absolutely nothing at all. The old maxim was, "If you would have good beer, you must go to bed with your brewer." The wife is the brewer; the very cheerful undertaker of this part of the duty of the family: she likes the beer herself better than water; and she has the other most powerful motive, that of keeping her husband at home. In support of these, my opinions, the House will

permit me to read the evidence given by several persons, before the Beer-bill Committee of last year. At the head of these stands Mr. SIMEON, a magistrate for Oxfordshire and Berkshire, who, in order to be able to lay accurate opinions upon the subject before the committee, sent a circular to the overseers and ministers of fifteen parishes; and the answer of all, except one, was, that the cure for the evils of beer-shops, and the greatest possible advantage to the country, would be, to enable the poor people to make their malt, and to brew at home. The evidence of these gentlemen, every word of which is worthy of the best attention of the House, was in the following words:

Mr. SIMEON, a magistrate for Oxfordshire and Berkshire. The last question is, "Would great advantages result from enabling the poor people to make their malt and brew at home, both as regards their comfort and morality?"—That is the most important question of all. The answers are, *fourteen parties say it would be highly desirable*; one fears it might lead the labourers to steal barley.

"Are those answers indiscriminately the answers of the overseers and ministers of the different parishes, or is there any difference of opinion between the ministers and the overseers?—I should say that generally they all agree in their accounts. I believe that the answers are indiscriminately the same from the ministers and from the overseers.

"Are the answers from the overseers and the ministers jointly or separately?—Separately: the application was made separately to each of them, and neither knew that the other had an application to the best of my knowledge."

Mr. GOODLAKE, a magistrate for Berkshire.—"Did the cottagers brew beer in consequence of that public-house being put down?—No; cottagers have not an opportunity of brewing beer on account of the *high price of malt*."

Colonel BLAGRAVE, magistrate for Berkshire.—"Do you contemplate the absolute necessity of taking away the power of selling beer in this manner?—I think it would be a dangerous measure

without the *repeal of the malt-tax*, and the tax again put upon the beer; I think if the tax were put upon the beer and the *malt-tax repealed*, it would induce the lower class of people to brew their own beer."

"Will you state why without that alteration, you think it would be dangerous to repeal the present Beer-bill?—Because I think it has tended to increase the price of barley, and to give a little fillip to agriculture.

"Do you think that it has any effect in checking the consumption of spirits, and giving the lower orders an inclination to drink beer rather than spirits?—*I think the lower orders have had an inclination to drink beer rather than spirits*; but it has been reported to me that smuggled spirits have been introduced into those beer-houses, but to my knowledge I do not know it.

"Do you think that the greater facility of drinking beer has rather conduced to encourage the love of beer than the love of spirits?—I think it has, and the lower order of people have an idea that beer is much more wholesome for them."

BREDE (Sussex) Parish Vestry.—"Had the *malt-duty been taken off*, the agricultural labourer would have had his beer at home, and we think he would seldom be seen at the beer-shop: small-beer is the natural beverage of the labourers in agriculture; at once the most nutritious, the most wholesome, and the best support to the labourer, being part of the subsistence for the production of his physical powers, to enable him to perform a fair day's work.

HOOE (Sussex) Parish Vestry.—"We are decidedly of opinion if the *malt-duty had been repealed*, it would have been far preferable to the beer."

PLAYDEN (Sussex) Parish Vestry.—"We also beg to observe that the abolition of the *malt-duty* would have had a far more beneficial effect upon the habits and morals of the labouring class."

There was, indeed, one witness, who gave a different opinion, and that was

Mr. THURNALL, of Cambridgeshire, but he is a great maltster. His evidence was as follows: "Do you, or do you not believe, if the malt-duty was taken off so as to enable every man to brew at home, that the evils complained off would be greatly reduced, and a better morality amongst the poor be obtained?—I do not think it is possible for the labourer to brew his own beer; *I am not sure they would not in my county; in the first place he could brew so small a quantity, and there are very few cottages where the whole house is above the size of this room; he is not furnished with a copper; it is totally impossible for a labourer to brew his beer in the districts I have been in.*

"How was it done *formerly*, do you know?—Persons brewed their own beer, but I should think not a *tithe of the population* brewed; *but their habits have altogether altered.*

"Is it not a serious thing for a poor man if he brews a quantity of beer, and that beer *turns sour*?—Yes.

"He avoids *that risk*, does he not, by purchasing his beer?—*Undoubtedly.*

"You are aware that a brewing apparatus would cost to a poor man only 5s.?—I am aware it would cost a small sum; *but half of them would not be sober while the beer lasted; they would drink it in a day.*"

[Mr. CHILDERS, a member for Cambridgeshire, observed, that I had read only a part of the evidence of this man; that this man was his tenant, and a very respectable man. It is very true, that I read only a part, and I cited the evidence merely to contradict the notion of the habits of the people having changed. If I did not read the whole, it was merely to save time; and if the orders of the House would have permitted me to reply, I should have observed, that Mr. CHILDERS left out, in his reading, the first of the two *nots* which will be found in the second member of the first sentence of the answers of this witness. I believe that Mr. CHILDERS gave the correct meaning of the witness, but that meaning is just the contrary of that which is found in the print; for, in the print the witness is

made to say, that he is *not* sure that the labourer would not brew his own beer; and Mr. CHILDERS made him say, that he *was* sure that he would not brew it: the context shows that Mr. CHILDERS's reading was correct, but not according with the evidence reported by the committee. If I could have replied, I should have answered the opinion of this man, that not a third of the people formerly brewed their own beer, by citing the positive evidence given by Mr. JOHN ELLMAN, before the committee of 1821, "that when he became a farmer, forty-five years before that, every man in his parish had his own beer, and enjoyed it by his own fire-side"; and that this evidence was then corroborated by a magistrate of Somersetshire, and by a gentleman who was then sheriff of Wiltshire. I did not like to waste time, as I never do, setting a very high value on time myself, or I should have observed, on the latter part of the evidence of this witness, the tenant of Mr. CHILDERS, who tells us, in one breath, that the labourer's beer "would turn sour," and in the next breath, "that he would drink it in a day"! However, no observation from me was necessary here; a general smile in the House showed that they smelled out the maltster, and rendered any reply to Mr. CHILDERS wholly unnecessary.]

In short, sir, I am satisfied that there is no argument to be offered in support of the belief, that labourers would not again brew their own beer, if this tax were repealed, and wholly abolished; and of all the benefits arising from this change, I defy pen or tongue to give an adequate description. But, there would be another great change take place; that is to say, that farmers would have beer to give to their men who work out of their house, or rather to men who are not inmates of the house. On this subject we have the following evidence, taken before the agricultural committee of last year, of Mr. SANDERS of Lancashire, and of Mr. BROWN, a large farmer and a surveyor, of Wiltshire, and this evidence, in the following words, is very worthy of the best attention of the House:

Mr. SANDERS.—"Does not the malt-tax press more immediately on a man

"who gives beer to his labourers, directly as well as indirectly?—I have no doubt if the malt-tax were removed, it would be a great improvement in his condition."

MR. RUDDELL BROWN.—"Would the labourers in your neighbourhood, if the law were to abolish the beer-shops and restore only the public-house, be likely to complain?—They would like it quite as well. The greatest possible relief that could be given to the agricultural labourers, would be by putting on the beer-duty again, and taking off the malt-duty, which would enable them to make or buy small quantities of malt, and brew their own beer."

"Do you not think if that were the case, the farmers would be more ready to give their labourers beer in agricultural districts?—I am quite sure of it; it is nothing but the high duty which has kept them from it; the taking off the beer-duty has been no relief to the agricultural labourer."

"What do you think the people of Devizes would say to the putting on the beer-duty again?—Probably if the malt-duty were not taken off at the same time, they would complain; but if the malt-duty were taken off, I am sure they would rejoice."

"Is there, without them, convenience for a labouring man to obtain beer for his dinner?—I have myself given my labourers beer, though it has cost me an immense sum for my malt bill every year; but still I know a man cannot work well without beer, and I wish as much as possible to keep my labourers away from the beer-shops."

The advantage to the farmer, as well as to the labourer, from giving beer instead of money, is of so much importance, as hardly to admit of exaggeration in the statement. Every one acquainted with these matters knows well, that, in times of pressing haste, particularly in harvest, a farmer can do more with one pound's worth of beer than with four pounds in money. Money is too far from the lips to produce immediate effect. Then, as to regular hard work in hot weather. Set a company of men to work at mowing: they ask you for beer, and, as is generally

the case, you allow them sixpence an acre, or something an acre, in lieu of beer. The hot sun comes and clogs the spittle in their mouths, and draws the sweat from their bodies. Away they go, perhaps a mile, to lay out their sixpence in beer. Being there, they do not stop with the sixpence. Very likely the field does not see them again for that day: then follows the loss of time, so precious then to the farmer, and they have to thirst for the remainder of the hard work of mowing, or to slake their thirst with water, which communicates weakness instead of strength. Whereas, if they had beer from the farm-house, they would go to the bottles deposited in the hedge, take their drink and return to their work. The beer would be wholesome and strengthening; and it is the deeply-interested master who would then determine the quantity. Mr. RUDDELL BROWN told the committee, that he does this now; but Mr. RUDDELL BROWN is a great farmer and a rich man: it costs him, he tells the committee, "an immense sum" for malt every year. That immense sum it is not in the power of a common farmer to expend; and, therefore, generally, and almost universally, speaking, hard working men, and the best of labourers, too, are driven to the beer-shops from this cause; or to some place or other where they have to swallow the adulterated stuff made by the brewers.

Besides all these evils, there is the great evil of evils, the driving of the young people from the farm-houses. Great as the other objections to this tax are, this objection is greater than all the rest put together. This it is, which has been the great cause of the lamentable change which has taken place in the manners and the morals of the working-people of England. Every gentleman must know how slender the authority of poor and indulgent parents must necessarily be over young people from the age of twelve years upwards. In proportion as the parents are poor and miserable, in that same proportion, in nature's spite, their authority will be small. To have good grown-up men and women, you must begin the work when they are young. The hand of the poor parent is not strong

enough; and if the hand of the parent were strong enough, the heart would not be stout enough, for this work. Besides, there is no room in the cottage for any body but the father and mother and little children. In the farm-house is their proper place from the age of twelve to that of twenty, or some years more. There there are a master and a mistress, not liable to indulgence on account of kindred; but bound by the law to provide for the parties in sickness and health for the whole year through; bound still more strongly by the most weighty interest, to attend, not only to the good habits and the industry, but to the morals and manners of the young people living under the same roof with themselves. Let gentlemen figure to themselves a parish with a hundred young people, distributed amongst the farm-houses, subjected to the control of masters and mistresses, who, of necessity, will compel them to keep good hours, to rise early, to be diligent during the day, to be cleanly in their persons, to go to church on the Sunday, and who have the magistrate always at hand to punish disobedience of their lawful commands. Then suppose these young people all to be turned out and to be upon their own hands; strolling about on the Sunday, without any regard to the decencies of dress; assembling in groups, either in beer-shops or out of beer-shops; assemble they will, and whoever saw such an assemblage, without seeing mischief of some sort or other being the ultimate consequence. In short, this is the main cause of that fatal change which has taken place in the manners, the morals, the expertness, and the bodily strength, of the labourers of England; and every man, who is a judge of the matter, knows well, that this has been produced, in very great part, by the heavy expense required to furnish beer for the servants in husbandry; and that this heavy expense arises from the tax upon malt, and solely from that tax, no man will attempt to deny. This evil is so great that, unless it can be removed, all hope of restoring the country to a state of good morals and happiness, and even of safety, may be abandoned at once in despair. The right hon. Member for MANCHESTER

drew an astounding picture of the awful consequences of rejecting the proposition for an alteration of the corn-laws. He seems to have thought little of the present really awful situation of those who are concerned in the cultivation of the land. But I trust that this House will have that situation constantly in its mind, till it has done its best to restore content to the labouring millions, and restored something like peace and security to the property and the dwelling of the farmer; and, sir, I am perfectly satisfied that nothing would so powerfully assist in the accomplishing of this, so desirable an object, as the adoption of the motion which I now have the honour to submit to the House.

Gladly would I see the work performed by the noble Lord and his colleagues. Then, indeed, would the Government have strength; for then it would become dear to the hearts of the whole people. The honourable Gentlemen seem as firmly fixed now as is the seat upon which they are; but this measure would fix them firmly as the hills.

I here read my motion, which was seconded by my colleague, Mr. FIELDEN. It was my intention to give the mere points in the other speeches made upon this occasion: but to avoid a charge of unfairness in doing this, I will give the report as I find it in the Times, which, to the best of my recollection, is substantially correct. Whether the country be destined to be plunged into confusion or not, is more than I can say; but if it be destined to be saved from that horrible state, I know that amongst the means of salvation there must be a total abolition of this tax. For my own part, as long as I have a seat in Parliament, I will never cense my endeavours to cause this repeal. I wish the matter to be well and clearly understood by the whole of the people, and therefore it is that I have published the above speech, and the whole of the other speeches made on this occasion in a separate pamphlet.

Lord ALTHORP said, that as the question had been so recently discussed, it

was hardly to be supposed that the House had changed its opinion upon it. He therefore did not feel himself called upon to enter minutely into its merits. The hon. Mover had stated, that had it not been for the malt-tax the labouring agriculturists would have been able to brew their beer and drink it in their own houses. There could be no question of the advantage of the revival of such a practice, but it might be a question, whether it was dependent on the tax under discussion. The real question was, in what way in the present state of the finances of the country, it was possible to reduce the malt-tax. It had been very truly stated, that while the present amount of the establishments of the country was maintained, it would be difficult to effect any material reductions in taxation. He entirely agreed with the hon. Mover in the preference he gave to a repeal of the whole rather than half of the duty; but with regard to his assertion that it would benefit the people living in towns as much as those in the country, he would remark, that the only advantage the agriculturists would gain from a reduction of the duty, would be in their capacity of consumers, but undoubtedly every other class would profit in a like degree. He had stated, however, in a former debate, and he now repeated it, that the effect of carrying a resolution like that before the House, and founding a bill upon it, would be to produce a total stagnation in every financial measure which had been introduced to Parliament. Under these circumstances, therefore, he would refrain from following the hon. Member in detail. If the taking off the tax on malt were considered merely abstractedly, the arguments in favour of it would apply to the repeal of every other tax. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. Mover on the advantage labourers would derive from brewing their beer in their own houses, he (Lord Althorp) confessed he did not believe it likely that labourers would ever brew their own beer again. Whatever alterations were to be made in the malt-tax, he was still convinced that they would be able to buy beer cheaper than they could brew it. It was quite certain that people with large capital

could make the article at a cheaper rate than those with small; and in the present state of society, he confessed he had no hope of seeing the practice in question revived. In opposing the motion he was only sorry that he felt it to be his duty so frequently to do so.

Mr. H. CURTEIS said, that had it been in accordance with the forms of the House, he would have moved, as an amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Oldham, that from and after the 5. of October, 1835, one half of the duty on malt should cease and determine; and he thought Government would have consented to it. The hon. Member for Bridport (Mr. Warburton) had on a former occasion accused the agriculturists of wishing to put their hands into the pockets of the manufacturers; but this was not surely the case, since the landed proprietors had been as forward as any in recommending the repeal of the tax on beer. It was true a deficiency would be experienced in the Exchequer on the reduction of the malt-tax; but then how many eligible modes were there not only of repairing that deficiency, but of still further increasing the revenue! He had no hesitation in avowing his opinion that a tax on lotteries would be a most legitimate impost. By such a tax, 10,000,000*l.* a year might be raised. There was another article which he would subject to a higher scale of duty, that was gin; and he calculated that from 4,000,000*l.* to 5,000,000*l.* might be obtained from an increased land-tax. The hon. Member concluded by expressing a hope that the question would be pressed to a division.

Sir W. INGILBY observed, that though the question had been before disposed of, it was right it should be again tried. It was all very well to turn into ridicule the address with which he had introduced his motion on this subject; but that course could not be adopted now, for they had in the present instance the opportunity of hearing it discussed by one who was, perhaps, the most competent man to do so in the King's dominions. (A laugh). Why his (Sir W. Ingilby's) address should have been treated as burlesque he could not imagine, for when he made his motion last year, he had been taunted by the

noble Lord (Althorp) for not having named a substitute for the malt-tax he proposed to repeal. He had been called upon to state what equivalent he would throw into the Exchequer to make up the deficiency of some 4,000,000*l.* or 5,000,000*l.* of revenue; but when he last addressed the House he had taken care to specify some sources of revenue which, in his opinion, might form this equivalent. Even now he did not feel disposed to abandon his "budget," although attempts had been made to turn it into ridicule. People talked of buffoonery—he should like to know what greater buffoonery there could be than to vote one night in one way, with respect to the malt-tax, and next day to vote in a manner directly the reverse. He would vote with the hon. Member for Oldham; or with any other man who proposed a relief of taxation. He denied that his speech was buffoonery. He did not undertake the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer but by particular desire (laughter), and should never resume the office more. (Renewed laughter). However, buffoonery or no buffoonery, the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Curteis) was now found priggish in part from his budget with respect to a tax on gin, &c. (A laugh). As to the malt-tax, it was scarcely necessary for him to repeat his previously expressed opinion, that it was a most iniquitous and demoralizing mode of taxation, and that it ought to be altogether repealed. He should vote with the hon. Member for Oldham; who, he hoped, would divide the House, in order that the country might see who were the friends of agriculture, and, he would add, of trade and manufactures, upon the present occasion.

Mr. CHILDERS next addressed the House, but in a tone which rendered him inaudible in the gallery throughout the greater part of his speech. We understood him to resist the motion, and to express his belief that a repeal of the malt-tax would not afford that degree of relief which many imagined. He was satisfied that the humbler classes would not be enabled to brew their own beer by a repeal of the duty. At present, the beer-house keepers found that they could

not brew in competition with the brewers; what pretence was there for saying that the poor man could do so under any circumstances? In conclusion he observed, that the question having been already disposed of by a large majority, he did not see upon what grounds it could now be sustained.

Mr. C. FERGUSON was a friend and a member of the landed interest, but would nevertheless vote against the motion. He could not vote for taking off the whole of the malt-tax without seeing how the deficiency was to be supplied. He dared to say the hon. Member for Oldham would find means of supplying the deficiency by reducing the interest of the national debt [an hon. Member, we believe Mr. T. Attwood, here said, "And why not?"]; but he was not prepared to accede to such a proposition: the only other means of supplying the deficiency consisted in a property-tax. (Hear from the opposition). Perhaps those that cheered that sentiment thought that we should have a property-tax (hear, hear, from the opposition), but he was against such an inquisitorial and odious imposition, and therefore could not be expected to vote with the hon. Member, whose motion could not be carried into effect without shaking public credit or imposing an odious tax. (Hear).

Mr. SINCLAIR observed that he should rejoice to see a property-tax re-established, inasmuch as only by means of it could the fundholder be compelled to contribute a due proportion towards the support of the state.

Mr. M. PHILIPS said, that when, on reference to the division of last year, he found that of 66 county members who voted for the repeal of the malt-tax, but 24 had supported a property-tax (the only effectual substitute), he could not vote with the hon. Member for Oldham. He was not insensible to the heavy pressure of this tax, and would gladly see it repealed, if its repeal could be effected consistently with raising the necessary amount of revenue. But it being determined to keep faith with the public creditor, he could not see how the malt-duty was to be dispensed with, after the refusal of the House to sanction a property-tax. He wished to support and aid

agriculture as much as possible, being satisfied that if it were put in jeopardy, trade could not long continue prosperous. As before stated, his vote rested solely on the divisions of last year, and till he saw a different disposition in the House, he did not consider himself warranted in voting otherwise.

Mr. MAXWELL said, that if the hon. Member for Oldham thought proper to divide the House, it would be his duty to vote with him, and although he might go out in an extremely small minority (No, no, from the opposition), as he used to do with the hon. Member for Middlesex, he foresaw that that minority would ere long rule the House. (Hear; and a laugh).

Mr. ROMILLY would vote with the hon. Member for Oldham on this occasion.

Mr. T. ATTWOOD thought it his duty to vote with the hon. Member for Oldham, and he trusted he should do so not in a contemptible but in a considerable minority. No man could look at any breach of national faith, or at an unjust reduction of the interest of the public debt, with greater disapprobation than himself. He wished that the hon. Member for Kirkeudbright would display a little sympathy for trade and commerce, as well as for the fundholder. The only "public faith" to which he (Mr. Attwood) objected, was the unhallowed support of the fundholder in the possession of enormous and unnatural wealth, while the farmer, manufacturer, and merchant, were beat down to the earth. Take England throughout, at this moment, and you will find three farmers out of four in a state of insolvency. When he saw the wholesale destruction of other classes of the community, he could not perceive any impropriety in taking up the case of the fundholders. The noble Lord had imposed a heavier burden on agriculture than Pharaoh did upon the Egyptians (a laugh), he meant upon the children of Israel, when they were required to make bricks without straw. The noble Lord asked the agriculturists to pay rent without money—to meet their mortgages without the means. He called upon the noble Lord, as a man with a heart in his

bosom, and a head, which he had (a laugh), to bring down the public burdens to a level with the public means of sustaining them. He (Mr. Attwood) wanted to make all classes flourish, happy, and united under the shadow of the King's throne. Was there any class, with the exception of the fundholders, mortgagees, and placemen, that was now contented? The noble Lord's measures had placed industry, capital, trade, and agriculture, at the feet of the monied interest. The monied interest itself must finally sink if the present system were continued. He called upon the noble Lord to do justice to all parties; that was the true way to preserve the public faith. The tax in question was about 5,000,000*l.* per annum, but he was satisfied that in order to produce that amount 10,000,000*l.* per annum was charged upon the English people. He paid 8*s.* 6*d.* per bushel for malt: the barley cost 3*s.* 6*d.*, and the tax was 2*s.* 7½*d.*, making in all 6*s.* 1½*d.*; instead of which, as before stated, he had to pay 8*s.* 6*d.* It would be seen from this how much above the amount of the actual duty the cost of malt was augmented by the present system. The removal of the tax would probably raise the price of barley from 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* per bushel, and the people would put 3*s.* 6*d.* in their pockets, and the farmers perhaps 1*s.* 6*d.* This was a question in which the people at large, and not merely the agriculturists were interested, and as the representative of a great body of manufacturers, he joined heart and hand with the agriculturists in urging the great boon of the total abolition of the malt-tax. The hon. Member proceeded to touch upon the subject of wages and subsistence, and argued, that if the wages of labour were to be reduced, the taxes which enhanced the prices of the necessities of life ought to be proportionably diminished, if we wished to see our population in comfortable circumstances. The French and Austrian soldiers had only 3*d.* a day; would the noble Lord attempt to reduce the allowance of the English soldiers to the continental level? In defiance of all the trades' unions in the kingdom, the wages of labour would sink under a metallic standard to the level of

1792. Such being the case, must not the price of necessaries be reduced; and, in order to effect this, must not the taxes upon necessaries be lowered or removed? "But," said the noble Lord, "if we take off 5,000,000*l.* of taxation, how are we to get on?" He (Mr. Attwood) knew that in the event of such a reduction the noble Lord could not go on with the present system; but had the noble Lord considered how the landholder was to go on with his mortgages, and the necessary provisions for his family? How, with his benevolent and manly mind, could the noble Lord see this great nation "swept with the besom of destruction"? It had been said that it would be a robbery of the noble Lord opposite to deprive him of the malt-tax; but he (Mr. Attwood) hoped the noble Lord would soon not only be robbed of the malt-tax, but also of many other imposts which pressed so heavily upon the industry of the country. Until the noble Lord thus relieved the people, he trusted he would be as restless upon his pillow, as millions were rendered by the pressure of taxation, indeed he could not understand how the noble Lord could rest tranquilly in the same bed with his victims. (Cries of Oh, oh, and question). He (Mr. Attwood) should most unquestionably give his vote in favour of the motion of the hon. Member for Oldham.

(To be continued.)

DISTRESSING CASE.

Normandy, 5. March, 1835.

I HEAR from the WEN, that *great trouble* prevails amongst the WHIGS and ANTI-TORIES; that is to say, amongst the WHIGS, and those MEMBERS who always opposed them, who called them the *worst of tyrants*, who addressed the King to turn them out, and who have *now endeavoured to vote them in again*, even before they see what their successors will do! These two parties are *dear friends* at present: they have sunk "all minor considerations"; and by their amiable ardour of mutual affection, remind me of the maxim, so familiar to

my ears fifty years ago, "The falling out of lovers is *the renewal of love*." "Ah! dame," said the mother of a very pretty girl, that I yet recollect, who had had a quarrel with her chap, "it doon't signify tawken, "they were *made for one another*, and "they *wool come together*." Yes; but then she meant that they would *bide together*, which these unhappy lovers of the House of Commons, alas, cannot! Next Tuesday night severs them, for a time, if not for ever. The Whigs, the greedy, the voracious, the perfidious faction, must vote against the repeal of the malt-tax, or openly and brazenly repeat that of which I accused them: *being merciful from motives of malignity!* If they do oppose the repeal of the tax, they must be opposed by their *anti-Tory associates!* And then it is that we shall see who has acted the wise and consistent part: those who rushed into the arms of the perfidious Whigs, or those who kept aloof from both the factions. Tuesday night will show us who and who are together. It will be so curious a thing to see about a hundred men, who have tried, as far as voting would go, to get the Whigs back again into office; it will be a curious thing, to see these hundred men *voting against these same Whigs*, and exposing them to the hatred of the people! Yet *this must take place on Tuesday night*, unless, indeed, the sensible "anti-Tories" are so in love with political damnation as still to cling to the Whigs, though to the notorious injury of the people. It is Tuesday night that will give us a list of "*Ayes*" and "*Noes*," that will be worth preserving. It will be so beautiful to hear Sir ROBERT PEEL and his colleagues on one side of the House; and Mr. POULETT THOMSON, Lord JOHN RUSSELL and their colleagues on the other side of the House, all speaking against the repeal; just as if they were all of one party; and then it will be so pleasant to see the "*Anti-Tories*" voting FOR Sir ROBERT PEEL! I say voting for Sir ROBERT PEEL and the Tory Administration. Tuesday night will tell us who ought to be put upon the "*black-list*." Millions of mouths are feeling imaginary thirst after a pot of home-brewed beer. All eyes are fixed upon

Tuesday night : every one will be remembered for his conduct on that night : that night is to decide whether the working-people be to expect anything like justice ; or whether they be not. And on that night it is that the Whigs, the perfidious Whigs, the savage Whigs, will, if Sir ROBERT PEEL be wise, receive their death-blow ; and this monstrous, this grinding, this sanguinary faction, who have been the scourge of England for two hundred years, will be annihilated for ever. Lord ALTHORP attempted to frighten us with " a PROPERTY-TAX." Now, if the House determine that it is just and necessary to have a tax to supply the place of what arises from the malt-tax ; and if I be convinced, that the necessity does exist, I have no objection to a property-tax. In such a case, it may be my share to pay a hundred pounds a year in a property tax ; but then, that which I pay will go into the Exchequer, at once, and not into the hands of monopolists. But, and to this it is that I wish I could draw the attention of the Minister ; I wish I could make him know that which I know about *the effects* of this malt-tax. I wish to draw his attention to this. I know very well that it is to be very shallow, not to be able to trace a property-tax down to a working man ; and to see that he bears his share of it, and a very large share of it, too. I know, and so does every man, who has thought much on the matter, that people deceive themselves, when they think that no tax reaches a man which he *does not actually pay himself*. It is not, therefore, the mere amount of the malt-tax that I complain of. It is not the *weight* of IT upon the working man ; but it is of the immense cost of its consequences. There arises out of it a monopoly which costs the consumers *eight millions a year, one farthing of which never goes into the Exchequer*. It costs, besides this, half a million of money annually in the collection ; and, oh, God ! what does it cost, in the destruction of the character of the people, in the country, especially ! It drives young men from the farm-houses, and into the beer-houses, where it destroys their health by the drugs that it causes them to swallow, besides the utter ruin

of their morals and of their value as working men. It drives the married man away from his family. In short, it is one of the great causes of the breaking up of the agricultural community of England, which, under the wise laws to secure service in husbandry, was the happiest community, and the most virtuous, that the world ever saw. Every man, three-score years old, can remember, that, for a young man in the country *not to be in yearly service*, was taken to be, without any inquiry, evidence against his character ; and, there must have been some peculiar circumstances ; such as a widowed mother to live with, and take care of ; an aged father, who stood in need of the assistance of his son : there must have been some circumstances of a peculiar nature to prevent justices of the peace from bringing before them young men not in yearly service, and making them account for *why they were not in service*. How all is changed ! The rare thing now is, to find one that is in yearly service ; and their reluctance to be in service, and under the consequent control of service, is quite astonishing. Now, as I could, if I had time, fully explain how large a share the malt-tax has had in producing these sorrowful effects, let me observe, with regard to a property-tax, it can have no such tendency. In the first place, the cost of collecting it is nothing worth speaking of ; in the next place, it creates no monopoly ; it does not draw the fruits of industry into great heaps, to give it to idlers. It does not drive men from the farm-houses ; and send them by thousands into the jails for poaching and hen-roost robbing. It does not drive the married men away from their families. In short, it is free from all the prodigious objections to the malt-tax. If Sir ROBERT PEEL had been brought up in a village ; had personally known every human being in it, he would naturally have been an observer of their conduct, for he must have observed it ; and, if he had, not one moment would he have hesitated about the repeal of the malt-tax. I see no one who can reasonably object to a property-tax, first establishing that it is *necessary*.

This was the measure to adopt, instead

of an irritating, an insulting, a rebellion-creating, Poor-law Bill. What was the great complaint? Why, *that sturdy young men come and demand relief as a right*. And the charge against them was (and I beg Sir ROBERT PEEL to observe it), that they *spent all their summer earnings, and then came to the parish to keep them in the winter*. Now, I put it to any man of common sense and of common humanity, to say, whether they could be reasonably blamed for this? Who, that has any consideration for others, will not see that this would inevitably be the case? Do you find young men, in any state of life, very prone to husband their resources; especially when they have no fixed home, and no one to control or to guide them? But, is it then, their faults? Not at all. They ought to be in yearly service, as they formerly were; and, why are they not? "The farmers and their wives and daughters are got to be so proud, that they will not admit them into their farm-houses." Well, then, it is not the fault of the poor young men; nor is it the fault of the Poor-law Act of ELIZABETH. The new Poor-law Bill may create a rebellion, after having caused mischiefs enormous; but it never can mend the morals and manners of the people. It never can take the two hundred and eighty poachers out of DEVIZES-jail, who are there now, grinding corn upon a tread-mill. If a convulsive revolution should, at last, be produced by unwise efforts to keep up what is called *public credit*, the new Poor-law Bill may, possibly, make that revolution bloody; but it never can answer any of the purposes for which it was hatched. All men who understand the matter agree with me, that we must get the young people back into the farm-houses; or that there must be a breaking-up of society in England.

But, how is this to be done? The farmers will not have them back; but we assemble at Westminster to very little purpose, if we are incapable of devising any means of inducing the farmers to act, in this respect, for their own good. There is the *statute* (as wise a one as ever was framed) for regulating the service in husbandry, making it convenient, advanta-

geous, creditable, and safe, to both master and man. It was not necessary, at the time of passing that statute (which was only a continuation and correction of similar statutes, succeeding each other for seven hundred years); it was not necessary, when that statute was passed, to make provision to create a disposition in masters and men to give effect to that statute; for they had the disposition on both sides. This is necessary now: the pride, the whims, the vulgar notions, of the upstart, are not to be suffered to endanger the peace, the happiness, and the greatness of a nation. "What!" the bull-frog farmer will exclaim, "Has the Parliament any right to compel me, against my will, to keep and feed people under my roof?" Yes, the perfect right, if, by these people you cultivate your farm and gain your profits; and for this there are thousands of cases in point in the wise laws of this country. But, *direct compulsion* is not what a wise Parliament would resort to; and I would forfeit my life, if a law could not be so framed, as to give no man, labourer, or farmer, just cause of complaint; and that should leave none but the men disorderly, here and there one in a parish, chargeable to the parish, during the very next winter. By one month after next Michaelmas-day, the whole of this monstrous evil might be made to cease to disgrace this formerly happy agricultural community. The malt-tax is the *first step*: the rest would easily follow; and that, too, without any Poor-law Commissioners and penny-a-line CHADWICKS, and eight-hundred-a-year runners, scouring the country, and driving the labourers up into groups, to consult on their *means of defence*.

LEGACY TO PARSONS.

THIS work, owing to a change in the printing-office of my printers, cannot come out until the 31. of this month. When it is out, we shall hear no more talk about "*Dissenters' grievances*," without hearing of church-people's *grievances* at the same time. I say, that this church (tak-

ing temporalities and spiritualities both together) is a greater abuse than any other that ever existed in the world, in any country, or in any age; and when Sir ROBERT PEEL said that he was ready to correct every *proved abuse*, he could not have had, and he certainly had not, the most distant idea of the astounding facts, which will now be brought to light. I intended to have this book sold for half-a-crown; but considering that that is beyond the reach of a great many of those whom I wish to read it, I shall sell it for EIGHTEEN-PENCE, bound in the same manner as the "*Legacy to Labourers*."

Will be published,

On Tuesday, the 31. March,

COBBETT'S

LEGACY TO PARSONS;

OR,

Have the Clergy of the Established Church an equitable right to the Tithes, or to any other thing called Church Property, greater than the Dissenters have to the same? And ought there or ought there not, to be a separation of the Church from the State? In Six Letters, addressed to the Hampshire Parsons.

CONTENTS.

1. How came there to be an established Church?
2. How came there people to be called Dissenters?
3. What is the foundation of the domination of the former over the latter?
4. Does the Establishment conduce to religious instruction?
5. What is the state of the Establishment? and, is it possible to reform it?
6. What is that compound thing, called Church and State? and what would be the effects of a separating of them?

In a neat little volume, bound in leather, price 1s. 6d. same form (but thicker) as *Legacy to Labourers*.

SEED BAGS.

Normandy Farm, 14. February, 1835.

The following is a list of the Seeds in the bag. A copy of it will be found in each bag. Each bag is 10s. 6d. There are *no larger bags*; because it has been found inconvenient; and, in the case of LARGE GARDENS, two or three bags may be had; which will be convenient, too, for *different sowings*. I trust that the Seeds will now be found to be *safely done up*; and I pledge myself for their *goodness*. The number on the bags tells the *sort* that is within. Owing to an accident, the list is *not quite alphabetical*; but, this is of no importance.

No.

1. Asparagus.
2. Windsor Bean.
3. Long-pod Bean.
4. Early Masagan Bean.
5. Scarlet Running Kidney Bean.
6. White Running Kidney Bean.
7. Black Dwarf Kidney Bean.
8. Dun ditto
9. Speckled ditto.
10. Beet, blood Red.
11. White Brocoli.
12. Purple ditto.
13. Early York Cabbage.
14. Savoy.
15. Scotch Kale.
16. Carrot.
17. Cauliflower.
18. Celery.
19. Chervil.
20. Cress.
21. Endive.
22. Leek.
23. White Coss Lettuce.
24. Mustard.
25. Onion.
26. Parsnip.
27. Parsley.
28. Knight Pea.
29. Early Scarlet Radish.
30. White Turnip Radish.
31. Spinage.
32. Squash.
33. Garden Turnip.
34. Cucumber.
35. Green Cabbage Lettuce.

36. Green Coss Lettuce.
37. Cobbett Corn.
38. Early Dwarf Cabbage.
39. Early Battersea Cabbage.
40. Early-frame Pea.
41. Dwarf Marrowfat Pea.
42. Tall Marrowfat Pea.

N.B. I have no *Cis-Alpine Strawberry Seed*; but, packets of *fine p'lants*, at 2s. 6d. each packet; which will bear great crops this year. To be had at Bolt-court.

From the LONDON GAZETTE.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

PORTER, W., Gower-street and Keppel-st., surgeon.

BANKRUPTS.

ADAMS, W., jun., Brown's-lane, Spitalfields, brewer.
 ALLEN, L., Pinner-green, Middlesex, inn-keeper.
 BARNARD, E., Little Baddow, Essex, cattle and sheep salesman.
 BAYNTON, T., Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, dealer in horses.
 BIRD, P., Cowbridge, Glamorganshire, grocer and tea-dealer.
 BURROW, J. and T. Hanley, Staffordshire, grocers.
 COATES, J., Manchester, merchant.
 COLLINSON, Thomas-street, Stamford-st., Blackfriars, hat-manufacturer.
 FORSTER, T. and R. Forster, Trygal, Northumberland, flour-dealers.
 FOX, J., Liverpool, wine-merchant.
 GOODBURN, J., Bishopsgate-street-within, silversmith and jeweller.
 M'CARTHY, D. T., Bristol, stationer.
 POPE, J. W., Wood-street, Cheapside, carpet-warehouseman.
 SLEE, N., Princess-street, Blackfriars, leather-dealer.
 TURNBULL, J., Northumberland, cabinet-maker and grocer.
 WILLIAMS, J., Chester-le-street, Durham, linen and woollen-draper.
 WRIGHT, B., Liverpool, ship-broker and merchant.

TUESDAY, MARCH 3.

INSOLVENT.

LEWIS, T., Liverpool, merchant.

BANKRUPTS.

BROWN, G., Marlborough, ironmonger.
 BUSWELL, J., and R. Wood, Derby, joiners:
 CROSBY, S., Coventry, dyer.
 DEACON, J., Reeth, Yorkshire, corn-factor.
 FLOOK, M., Kingswood-hill, Gloucestershire, currier.
 HATTON, P., HeatonNorris, Lancashire, inn-keeper.
 HOGG, B., jun., Armley, Leeds, cloth-manufacturer.
 HOLDEN, J., Bacup, Lancashire, cotton-spinner.
 HOYLE, J., Manchester, victualler.
 JAMES, W., Western-street, Brighton, grocer.
 KNAPE, E., Walsoken, Norfolk, cattle-salesman.
 RAY, G. A., Ramsgate, Kent, lodging-house-keeper.
 SWIFT, I. and G., Lane End, Stoke-upon-Trent, tailors.
 TAYLOR, W., Great Yarmouth, surgeon.
 WEST, J., Keate-street, Christchurch, Middlesex, victualler.
 WILKES, W. V., Birmingham, factor.
 WILMOT, S. R., Bristol, brewer.
 WRIGHT, J., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, jeweller.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, March 2.
 —We had but few arrivals of any grain during last week, owing in a great measure to the stormy weather: this morning we had a fair, but not a large supply of Wheat, Barley, Oats, and other grain.

Fine Wheat was taken off this morning at last Monday's prices, but there was hardly any sale for secondary qualities, even at lower prices.

Malting Barley was neglected, though offered 1s. per quarter cheaper than on last Monday, as the trade think it most prudent not to increase their stocks, in the uncertainty as to what Parliament may do in the malt duty. In grinding Barley, Beans, and Peas, no alteration.

Oats sold this morning on much the same terms as this day week, but the demand was not so brisk: prices keep up in Ireland about 1s. per barrel over what this market will net.

Wheat, English, White, new	42s. to 50s.
Old	48s. to 50s.
Red, new	38s. to 42s.
Old	38s. to 42s.
Lincolnshire, red	36s. to 41s.
White	42s. to 43s.
Yorkshire, red	36s. to 40s.
White	40s. to 42s.
Northumberl. & Berwick	37s. to 40s.
Fine white	37s. to 41s.
Dundee & choice Scotch	40s. to 42s.
Irish red, good	35s. to 36s.
White	38s. to 40s.

Rye	30s. to 34s.
New	34s. to 36s.
Barley, English, grinding	26s. to 28s.
Distilling	28s. to 32s.
Malting	32s. to 35s.
Chevalier	38s. to 42s.
Malt	44s. to 54s.
Fine new	56s. to 64s.
Beans, Tick, new	34s. to 36s.
Old	38s. to 40s.
Harrow, new	36s. to 38s.
Old	40s. to 43s.
Peas, White, English	36s. to 38s.
Foreign	35s. to 36s.
Gray or Hog	36s. to 38s.
Maples	38s. to 40s.
Oats, Polands	23s. to 26s.
Lincolnshire, short small	23s. to 24s.
Lincolnshire, feed	21s. to 23s.
Yorkshire, feed	22s. to 24s.
Black	23s. to 25s.
Northumberland and Ber-	
wick Potato	25s. to 26s.
Ditto, Angus	24s. to 25s.
Banff and Aberdeen, com.	24s. to 25s.
Potato	25s. to 27s.
Irish Potato, new	20s. to 23s.
Feed, new light	19s. to 20s.
Black, new	20s. to 21s.
Foreign feed	22s. to 24s.
Danish and Pomerian, old	20s. to 21s.
Petersburgh, Riga, &c. ..	22s. to 23s.
Foreign, in bond, feed..	12s. to 14s.
Brew.,	16s. to 18s.

SMITHFIELD, March 2.

This day's supply of Beasts and Sheep, for the time of the year, and Porkers, was moderately good: of calves rather limited. With prime small Veal trade was somewhat brisk; with Beef, Mutton, and Pork dull, at Friday's quotations.

About 1,900 of the Beasts, fully 1,000 of which were Scots, the remainder about equal numbers of Shorthorns, Devons, and Welsh runts, with a few hombreds and Irish Beasts, were from Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Cambridgeshire; about 550, in about equal numbers of Shorthorns, Devons, Welsh runts, Scots, and Irish Beasts, from Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, and others of our northern districts; about 250, chiefly Herefords, Devons, and Welsh runts, with a few Irish Beasts, from our western and midland districts; about 100, chiefly Sussex Beasts, from Kent, Sussex and Surrey; and most of the remainder from the stall-feeders, &c. near London.

A full moiety of the Sheep were new Leicesters, in about equal numbers of the South-down and white-faced crosses; about a fourth Southdowns, and the remainder about equal numbers of Kents, and Kentish half-breds, horned and polled Norfolks, and old Leicesters, with a few pens of old Lincolns, horned Dor-

sets and Somersets, horned and polled Scotch and Welsh Sheep, &c. There were about 200, for the most part Dorset, Lambs in the market.

Per stone of 8lbs. sinking offal.

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Inferior Beef	2	0	to	2 2
Ditto Mutton	2	2	to	2 4
Middling Beef	2	4	to	2 8
Ditto Mutton	2	8	to	3 0
Prime Beef	3	6	to	4 0
Ditto Mutton	3	6	to	4 0
Veal	3	0	to	5 4
Pork	3	0	to	4 0
Lamb	5	0	to	6 0

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent.	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons Ann. }	91½	51½	91½	91	90½	91½

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

Fourth Edition.

COBBETT'S Spelling-Book.

(Price 2s.)

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

Just published, price 1s. 4d. bound in leather,

COBBETT'S

LEGACY TO LABOURERS,

OR,

What is the Right which the Lords, Barons, and 'Squires, have to the Lands of England?

In Six Letters, addressed to the Working People of England.

WITH A

DEDICATION TO SIR ROBERT PEELE, BART.

By WILLIAM COBBETT, M.P.

FOR OLDMAN.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him at 11, Molt-court, Fleet-street.